

EQUITY AND LAW

LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY,
18, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, LONDON, W.C.
ESTABLISHED 1844.

DIRECTORS.

Chairman—John Croft Devereil, Esq. Deputy-Chairman—Richard Stephens Taylor, Esq.
Harold Agnew, Esq.
Alexander Dingwall Bateson, Esq., K.C.
C. E. Broughton, Esq.
Edmund Church, Esq.
Philip G. Collins, Esq.
Robert William Dibdin, Esq.
Sir Kenneth E. Digby, G.C.B., K.C.
Charles Baker Diamond, Esq.
Sir Howard W. Elphinstone, Bart.
The Hon. Mr. Justice Grantham.
Richard L. Harrison, Esq.
L. W. North Hickley, Esq.
Archibald Herbert James, Esq.
The Rt. Hon. Lord Macnaghten, G.C.M.G.
William Maples, Esq.
Edward Moberly, Esq.
The Hon. Mr. Justice Phillimore.
George Thompson Powell, Esq.
Mark Lemon Romer, Esq., K.C.
The Hon. Charles Russell.
H. P. Bowling Trevanion, Esq.

FUNDS EXCEED - - £4,750,000.

All classes of Life Assurance Granted. Reversions and Life Interests Purchased
Loans on Approved Securities entertained on Favourable Terms.

W. P. PHELPS, *Actuary and Secretary.*

FLOWERDEW & CO.,

COSTS DRAWN AND SETTLED (from papers alone, if necessary)
TRANSLATIONS OF NOTARIAL QUALITY.
VERBATIM LAW REPORTING.

Permanent Office Staff in each Department.

Head Offices: 14, BELL YARD, TEMPLE BAR, W.C.

Also at 11, Poultry and Salisbury House, E.C.

Telephones: Holborn 000 and Central 6150. Telegrams: "Flowerdew, London."

THE BRITISH LAW FIRE

INSURANCE COMPANY, LIMITED,
5, LOTHBURY, LONDON, E.C.

(with Branches throughout the United Kingdom).

SUBSCRIBED CAPITAL - £1,050,000 PAID-UP CAPITAL - £150,000
RESERVES - £235,000

General Manager—DAVID M. LINLEY. Secretary—T. WILLIAMS.
FIRE, LOSS OF PROFITS due to FIRE, WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION,
EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY, PERSONAL ACCIDENT AND SICKNESS,
BURGLARY, FIDELITY GUARANTEE, PROPERTY OWNERS' INDEMNITY, and
PLATE GLASS.

Gentlemen in a position to introduce Business are invited to undertake Agencies within
the United Kingdom. No Foreign Business undertaken.

LEGAL AND GENERAL

LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

ESTABLISHED 1836.

10, FLEET STREET, LONDON.

THE
PERFECTED SYSTEM
OF
LIFE
ASSURANCE.

FREE, SIMPLE AND SECURE.

FUNDS - - - £7,500,000 INCOME - - - £1,024,000
NEW BUSINESS 1910 - £3,315,000 BUSINESS IN FORCE - £27,713,000

TRUSTEES.

The Right Hon. The Earl of HALSBURY.
The Hon. Mr. Justice DYER.
RONER WILLIAMS, Esq., D.L., J.P.
CHARLES P. JOHNSON, Esq., J.P.
ROBERT YOUNGER, Esq., K.C.

DIRECTORS.

Chairman. Deputy-Chairman.
RONER WILLIAMS, Esq., D.L., J.P. CHARLES P. JOHNSON, Esq., J.P.
Deane, The Hon. Mr. Justice. Masterman, Henry Chauncy, Esq.
Farrer, Henry L., Esq. Mellor, The Right Hon. John W., K.C.
Fitch, Arthur J., Esq., J.P. Rawle, Thomas, Esq.
Follett, John G., Esq., J.P. Rider, Jno. E. W., Esq.
Frere, John W. C., Esq. Saltwell, Wm. Henry, Esq.
Grant-Moek, A., Esq., J.P. (Devises). Tweedie, R. W., Esq.
Haldane, Francis G., Esq., W.S. Younger, Robert, Esq., K.C.
Healey, Sir C. E. H. Chadwyck, K.C.B., K.C.

REVERSIONS AND LIFE INTERESTS.—The Society lends in
large or small amounts, and purchases at favourable prices.

The Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter.

LONDON, SEPTEMBER 23, 1911.

* * The Editor cannot undertake to return rejected contributions, and
copies should be kept of all articles sent by writers who are not on
the regular staff of the JOURNAL.

All letters intended for publication must be authenticated by the name
of the writer.

Annual Subscription, 26s., by post 28s., half-yearly and quarterly
in proportion.

Contents.

CURRENT TOPICS	767	SOCIETIES	774
SEAMEN AND THE WORKMEN'S COM- PENSATION ACT, 1906	770	LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL	774
REVIEWS	771	OBITUARY	774
CORRESPONDENCE	771	LEGAL NEWS	775
POINTS TO BE NOTED	772	WINDING-UP NOTICES	775
NEW ORDERS, &c.	773	CREDITORS' NOTICES	776
		BANKRUPTCY NOTICES	777

Case Reported this Week.

Rex v. Commissioner of Metropolitan Police, Ex parte
Holloway..... 773

Current Topics.

The Land Registry.

THOSE OF our readers who pass the Land Registry Office will
have observed that the neighbouring houses, which were pur-
chased with a view to the future extension of the Registry
building, are now placarded with notices of the sale of the
housebreaker's contents; meaning that the houses are to be
pulled down forthwith, and presumably also meaning that the
office is to be forthwith enlarged, so as to be capable of
dealing with the influx of business which will arise from the
extension of the compulsory system. Considering the definite
recommendation of the Royal Commission, "that the system
should be amended, and that if, after sufficient experience, the
amended system is found to work satisfactorily within the
present compulsory area of the County of London, a Bill for the
gradual extension of compulsion on sales to the rest of the
country by the establishment of local centres and branches in
the manner suggested by the Registrar should then be con-
sidered by Parliament," the procedure appears to be premature,
and apparently indicates the intention of the authorities to ride
roughshod over their own Commissioners' report and proceed as
soon as possible to extend the system throughout the kingdom.

The Papers to be Read at the Provincial Meeting.

THE SUBJECTS of the papers to be read at the Provincial
Meeting of the Law Society comprise most of the current topics
of the day, but only one (by Mr. RUBINSTEIN) relates specifi-
cally to land transfer. No doubt the delay in the issue of the
report of the Council accounts for this meagre representation of
the leading subject now before solicitors. The country law
societies have been engaged in considering the various knotty
questions to be dealt with in the report, and their members are
waiting to see how their suggestions are dealt with. We hope,
however, that this circumstance will not prevent a full discussion
of the subject à propos of the President's address. We note
with interest the appearance in the list of contributors of papers
of (we presume) a champion of women's rights in Mr. JACQUES,
of Bristol, who is to read a paper on the unfair position which
women occupy at the present time. The prejudiced male is
apt to allege that in many respects women occupy an unfairly
advantageous legal position; but we hardly think that this is
what Mr. JACQUES means to contend.

Increment Value Duty and Ground Rents.

TECHNICALLY the sale of a ground rent is the sale of a rever-
sionary interest in land, namely, the reversion on the long lease

under which the rent is payable. But so long as the lease has a considerable number of years to run, the rent itself is the real subject of sale, and the value is determined at so many years' purchase without regard to any changes in the actual value of the land out of which it issues. It is only when the lease is nearing its termination that the value of the land becomes an element in fixing the value. We gather from the correspondence with the Land Valuation Department which we are enabled by the kindness of a correspondent to print elsewhere, that this is the principle which the Inland Revenue Commissioners are prepared to recognize with respect to the assessment of increment value duty on the occasion of the sale of ground rents. They point out that in ascertaining the value of the consideration for the sale under section 2 (2) of the Finance Act, 1910, the consideration attributable to the reversionary interest has to be distinguished from that attributable to the ground rent; but if the reversion is deferred for a long period, no additional value is in practice allowed in respect of the reversion, and hence there is no value in respect of which increment value duty can be payable. The adoption of this view will very much facilitate the completion of sales of ground rents.

The Use of Firearms against Strikers in Self-Defence.

THE RECORDER of London had to decide an interesting point of criminal law in *Reg. v. Roberts* (75 J. P. 436), which came up at the Old Bailey on the 6th of September. The prisoner, a van-driver, was attacked by strikers during the recent van disturbances; police protection was inadequate, and the van was overturned by the assailants; in the course of the *melée* the accused fired a pistol and wounded a bystander. He was arrested and indicted on a charge of unlawful wounding; his plea was that he was justified in acting as he did in self-defence. The Recorder ruled—in our opinion rightly—that there must be reasonable apprehension of danger to life before a person attacked can use firearms in self-defence; there must also be no obvious means of escape. The further question as to whether or not the overturning of a heavy van which the prisoner was driving amounted to such endangering of his life as to satisfy the legal test he left to the jury; and they acquitted the prisoner. The law on the point is in reality well settled. A person assaulted is justified in defending himself, but must not use more violence than is reasonably necessary for that purpose (*R. v. Driscoll*; Car & M. 214). He is likewise justified in defending his dwelling-house or property which is lawfully in his own possession for the time being. But the nature of the assault determines the mode of defence he may use; to a common assault which does not endanger life he must not reply with a knife (*Reg. v. Hewlett*, 1 F. & F. 91); such weapon can only be used if serious injury is apprehended by him. Again, firearms can only be used when either his life is endangered by the assault, or his dwelling-house is attacked; they are not legally justifiable in defence of chattels (*Reg. v. Meade*, 1 Lewin, 184). And in all these cases there must be no other mode of achieving the object—namely successful defence.

The Legality of Prize Fighting.

THE LAWYER, as such, is not concerned with those social and ethical questions in relation to the proposed contest between a black and a white pugilist which have so much exercised public opinion during the last few days. But out of the prize-fight which seems likely to take place at Earls Court, there arise three legal points of interest and importance. The first concerns the legality or illegality of such combats. The second relates to the legal position of those who arrange or abet the fight. Lastly, there is the question how far the Executive Government has lawful authority to interfere. As regards the first of these points, the law of England is reasonably clear. An assault is a criminal offence—misdemeanour or felony according to the circumstances—unless it is justified. The consent of the party assaulted is a justification provided it is given freely (i.e. without force, fear, or fraud), and emanates from a sober and rational person capable of appreciating the nature and probable consequences of that to which he consents

(Stephens' Digest of Criminal Law, Art. 224). The blow struck must not be such as in ordinary circumstances would injure the party hit; it must not be struck in anger, revenge, or malice, and the assault must not be such as to occasion, or amount to, a breach of the peace (*Reg. v. Coney*, L. R. 8 Q. B. D. 534). The practical result of these three restrictions is that the infliction of blows upon another with his consent is never lawful unless it arises in the course of some well-recognized game, or contest in the nature of a game, such as football or a boxing-match. In the latter case it is now settled law that three additional conditions, corollaries of the above, must be observed in order to make the contest lawful. The pugilists must be protected by the use of padded gloves—a fight with naked fists is never defensible; the combat must comply with the accepted and reasonable rules of the game, and there must not be an intention to prolong it until one is injured or beaten beyond the capacity to fight (*Reg. v. Coney*, *supra*). If these conditions are complied with, the combat is legal; otherwise it is illegal. Of course, in ordinary prize-fighting the last-mentioned condition is never present; the intention always is that the fight shall continue until the vanquished party can no longer stand up. There can, therefore, be little or no doubt of its illegality. Equally little doubt exists as to the position of all who attend such a spectacle in case the above conditions are not complied with. The combatants are guilty of an assault; their backers are guilty of inciting a breach of the peace; and all present are guilty of aiding and abetting. Should one of the parties be killed, all persons concerned in the fight are obviously guilty of manslaughter. The pugilists would be principals in the first degree. Their backers would be principals in the second degree, and presumably so would be the spectators. At any rate, everyone who came to the exhibition aware of its purpose would be an accessory before the fact. The position of the police and of the Executive is not quite so simple, but we doubt if any real question can arise as to their right and duty. Where announcement is made that a contest will take place under conditions which clearly make it more than a mere permissible boxing-match, the Executive have notice that three illegal events are about to happen. First, a crime, possibly resulting in death, is contemplated. Secondly, there is to take place a breach of the peace. Lastly, there is to be what amounts to an unlawful assembly. It is the duty of the Executive, we submit, to prevent the crime from being committed; to preserve the King's peace; and to disperse the unlawful assembly. In so doing it can use any amount of force which is legally necessary to effect its object (see Dicey's Constitutional Law, Appendix on Martial Law). Unless, then, the projected combat is hedged in with conditions which stay the fight from proceeding beyond a limited number of rounds, there seems no doubt whatever that the police would be within their rights in stopping it at the outset.

"Reading the Riot Act."

THE QUESTION of the employment of the military forces of the Crown in aid of the civil power has been brought into prominence lately, and is unfortunately not unlikely to be brought forward in the future. It seems opportune to correct some rather general misapprehensions with respect to the Statute of 1714 (1 Geo. I. Stat. I, cap. 5), which is commonly known as the Riot Act. This short title has been authoritatively conferred on the Act by the Short Titles Act, 1896, but in at least one legal text-book of great utility and authority the Act is consistently referred to as "the Riot Act, 1716" [*sic*]. The use of the phrase, "reading the Riot Act," is one of the minor mistakes commonly made about the Act. Perhaps the mistake has been partly brought about by the provision of section 7, under which the Act is to be "openly read at every Quarter Sessions," &c. At any rate, when the "Act" is said to be "read" in the presence of a riotous mob, what is meant is that the proclamation set out in section 2 is read aloud. The Act, as already stated, was passed in 1714, and is chapter 5 of the second "statute," or session, of the first year of George I. It did not come into force until "after the last day of July" 1715, and it is possible that the Royal Assent was not given in the year 1714, but in 1715, as now reckoned according to the New

Style. No dates are given to the statutes of that time to shew precisely on what day they were assented to. The important sections of the Riot Act are sections 1 and 2. Section 1, after a preamble stating that "of late many rebellious riots and tumults have been in divers parts of this Kingdom, to the disturbance of the public peace," proceeds to enact that "if any persons to the number of twelve or more, being unlawfully, riotously, and tumultuously assembled together, to the disturbance of the public peace," after being commanded by proclamation to disperse, do not disperse in the course of one hour, "such continuing together to the number of twelve or more . . . shall be adjudged felony without benefit of clergy . . ." The penalty for "felony without benefit of clergy" was, of course, death, but by section 1 of the Penal Servitude Act, 1891, penal servitude for not less than three, nor more than five, years, or imprisonment for not more than two years, may be imposed. Section 2 of the Riot Act gives the form of proclamation to be used—"in these words, or like in effect: Our Sovereign Lord the King chargeth and commandeth all persons being assembled immediately to disperse themselves, and peaceably to depart to their habitations or to their lawful business, upon the pains contained in the Act made in the first year of King GEORGE for preventing tumults and riotous assemblies. God save the King." There is nothing in the Act to justify the notion that the employment of the military forces of the Crown is illegal until the proclamation under the Riot Act has been read. Reading the proclamation is merely the last effort of the civil power to assert itself, and is thus only evidence of the gravity of the situation. There is also nothing in the Riot Act to justify the notion that the civil authorities have no right to disperse the mob, by calling in the military or otherwise, before the expiration of an hour from the reading of the proclamation. A magistrate must still do, independently of the provisions of the Riot Act, "what the general rules of the common law require of him in this respect": see *Rez v. Pinney*, 3 St. Tr. N.S. 11, at p. 519.

Statutory Definitions of Land Values.

WE PRINTED recently (*ante*, p. 736) an interesting letter with respect to the statutory definition of land values, in which our correspondent pointed out, with reference to original valuations, that "gross value" and "total value" were both eliminated in carrying out the operations prescribed by section 25 of the Finance Act, 1910, for arriving at assessable site value, and that assessable site value can, in fact, be arrived at by ascertaining "divested value," under sub-section 2, and subtracting from it the value of the "outsiders' rights" referred to in sub-section 3. The formulæ he used shewed this clearly, but, as we intimated, it is not so clear that "gross value" is also eliminated in making occasional valuations under section 2. Our correspondent's argument here was more difficult to follow, and we were mistaken in saying that he read paragraph (d) as though its provisions as to total value applied also to the previous paragraphs. Under paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) a value based on purchase price or on valuation for estate duty is substituted for total value, while under paragraph (d) total value is to be estimated in accordance with section 25, and so far these paragraphs are distinct. But then come the important words—"subject in each case to the like deductions as are made, under the general provisions of this part of this Act as to valuation, for the purpose of arriving at the site value of land from the total value," and these clearly refer to section 25 (4). But the first deduction is G-D, and it seems to us that our correspondent's formulæ do not apply to occasional valuations made under paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of section 2. As long as total value (T) is represented by G-O under section 25 (3), then site value reduces itself under section 25 (4) to D-O, and gross value and total value are both eliminated. But the total value which has to be used under paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) is a concrete figure taken from the actual transaction, and cannot be represented by G-O; hence, when we proceed under section 25 (4), to make the first deduction, namely G-D, the two G's do not cancel, and it is necessary to ascertain both gross value and divested value. But, as our correspondent points out, the statutory total value is not required for arriving at site value, whether original or occasional. It will be interesting to see how this com-

licated array of values, actual and hypothetical, will be dealt with when they come before the courts. The algebraical symbols are forced upon us, but we are not sure that the judges will take kindly to them.

Redemption of Debentures.

A PERSON who subscribes for a debenture may look to a transfer of the debenture as a means of getting his money back when he wants it, and the company are, therefore, able sometimes to introduce their own provisions as to repayment in the debenture; but the recent decision of PARKER, J., in *Re Tewkesbury Gas Co.* (1911, 2 Ch. 279), shews that such provisions must not contradict the primary liability of the company to pay the debt: they cannot leave the payment to the option of the company. In that case debentures issued in 1892 contained an agreement for repayment "on or after 1st January, 1898," and provision was made for redemption of the debentures, and for determining by ballot which should be repaid. The 1st of January, 1898, passed, and the company never held any ballot or paid off any debentures, but they regularly paid the interest. A transferee of a debenture gave six months' notice requiring repayment, and on the money not being paid, sued for it, and PARKER, J., held that the action was maintainable. The provision for payment on or after the fixed date allowed the company to postpone payment till that date, but the money then became payable on demand; and the provision under which the company might at their option hold a ballot, and repay according to the ballot, was repugnant to their primary liability to repay and was void. The learned judge also followed *Re Chicago and North West Granaries Co.* (1898, 1 Ch. 263), in holding that a debenture cannot be construed by reference to the prospectus in pursuance of which it was issued. The contract between the company and the debenture holder is contained in the debenture, and the prospectus cannot be looked at for the purpose of seeing what the contract was.

Double Taxation of Income.

A CORRESPONDENT calls our attention to an omission in our observations last week (*ante*, p. 762) on the subject of double taxation. In reference to income tax we said that a person residing here has to pay tax on his entire income wherever arising, notwithstanding that part might be produced in a foreign country and might have to pay tax there. For the purpose of a general statement of this kind it was, perhaps, hardly necessary to refer to the qualification introduced by *Colquhoun v. Brooks* (14 App. Cas. 493), though, to be strictly correct, we ought to have confined the observation to income actually received in this country. As was held in that case, a person resident here and engaged in a trade carried on entirely abroad is liable to income tax in respect of so much only of the profits of the trade as are received in the United Kingdom. But the practical importance of this exception is diminished by the circumstance that, to escape taxation, the income must be allowed to accumulate abroad, and in general people require to have income remitted to their place of residence; and also that the business must be exclusively carried on abroad; see *San Paulo Brazilian Railway Co. v. Carter* (1896, A. C. p. 40). Hence, if the person in question is more than a sleeping partner—if he takes any active part in the business—it probably ceases to be carried on exclusively abroad, and the exception does not apply. But whatever may be the exact extent of the exception, we gather that our correspondent does not dispute the general accuracy of our observations as to the possible liability of income to double taxation.

The County Courts Statistics.

THE COUNTY COURTS Statistics for 1910, which have just been issued, shew the large amount of business which these tribunals attract. In the main they continue to be the means of collecting small debts, and there was a total of 1,270,853 plaints for sums not exceeding £20. Above that amount the figures rapidly diminish; 12,763 between £20 and £50; 2,376 between £50 and £100; while there were 384 matters heard by consent in which the claim exceeded £100. Of the plaints entered some

two-thirds led to judicial determination; namely, 870,172 without a jury and 677 with a jury. In only an insignificant number of cases was the defendant successful, namely, 1,356 by non-suit and 6,987 otherwise. The plaintiff succeeded in 430,867 on the hearing; in 345,553 by consent or admission; and in 86,086 by default. The warrants of commitment issued were 140,660, and in 8,189 cases the debtors were imprisoned. The total amount for which plaintiffs were entered was £3,711,540, and judgments were obtained for £2,047,778 in respect of debts, and £187,440 for costs, exclusive of fees. The table of the sittings of the judges does not indicate that they are at present overworked. In circuits 1, 57 and 59, which represent Northumberland, Somerset, and Cornwall, the judge sat on 114, 110, and 115 days respectively; and other circuits, exclusive of the metropolitan courts and those where there were two judges, show numbers ranging up to 180 at Halifax and 181 at Birkenhead and Derby. The average number of sittings appears to be about 150. The actual sittings may not represent all the demands on a judge's time, but they furnish a tolerable guide on the question of undue pressure.

The Complexities of our Jury System.

THE DEMAND of the Trade Union Congress that a Royal Commission should inquire into the administration of our jury system calls attention to the intricacies and anomalies which occur in that system at the present day. Some juries are paid—namely the Coroner's Jury and the Special Jury—others are unpaid. Of the two who are paid, the former receive one shilling each, the latter one guinea per diem. Some juries return verdicts by a majority (namely, the Coroner's Jury and the Grand Jury); others must be unanimous (Common and Special Jury). Some consist of twelve members, and others of twenty-three. Again the qualifications which divide the Common from the Special Jurymen are anomalous; they vary in the counties, the boroughs, and the metropolis. Lastly, it is doubtful whether or not special jurymen's names should be placed on the common jury list as well as their own; the practice varies according to the view of each sheriff. Again, the selection of names from the list is notoriously a matter as to which no rule exists—*quod* under-sheriff's *tot sententia*. The time has come for a revision and simplification of the system.

Seamen and the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1906.

UNLIKE ITS predecessor of 1897, the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1906, includes seamen within the scope of its benefits, provided that they otherwise conform to the definition of "workmen" given in the Act. This extension of the prior statute has not been without its interest, since many of the cases which have done most to elucidate the Act have arisen in connection with seamen—a class of men the conditions of whose employment present in a more striking light than is the case with more prosaic vocations some of the anomalies and difficulties that legislation on this subject-matter almost of necessity raises.

Before discussing these cases it is perhaps as well to point out that there are certain modifications in the Act and the Statutory Rules made under it where seamen are concerned. Section 7 (1), which states that the Act is to apply to masters, seamen and apprentices in the sea and seafishing service, who belong to a ship registered in the United Kingdom, and whose managing owner resides in the United Kingdom, attaches certain special conditions in their case. Notices of accident, except where the accident and incapacity both take place on board ship, are to be served on the master; in case of death, notice of claim must be made within six months after news of death has reached the claimant; if the injured person is left behind abroad, depositions as to the accident, &c., are to be taken there, and when taken are admissible in England as evidence; if the deceased leaves no dependants, no compensation is payable where the owner of the

ship is liable, under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, to pay the expenses of burial; weekly compensation is suspended so long as, under that Merchant Shipping Act, the owner is liable to maintain the injured sailor; compensation is not affected by the owner's right to limit his liability for accidents caused by a collision under section 503 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894; and the sections of that Act which relate to the recovery of wages by seamen lost with their ship relate also to Workmen's Compensation proceedings. Again, under the Rules (1907–1909), there are quite a number of special Rules which govern the proceedings to recover compensation in the case of seamen, and which provide, among other things, for the detention of the ship unless and until an undertaking to pay the damages that the arbitrator may award has been given. Finally, it has been held—though the Act itself is silent—that section 8 of the Act which refers to the certificate of decease to be given by the certifying surgeon under the Factory Act, 1901, does not apply at all to seamen: *Curtis v. Black & Co.* (1909, 2 K. B. 529). We have mentioned these points at length since they are rather apt to be completely overlooked by solicitors with an ordinary compensation practice who happen unexpectedly to get a seaman's case; they are apt to apply the ordinary procedure, with the result that time, costs and sometimes even compensation itself, are lost to their clients.

Turning to the decided cases, we find that, in the case of seamen, as in the case of other workmen, difficulty has arisen in deciding what exactly is a "contract of service," such as is made a condition precedent to the benefits of the Act by section 13 thereof. In the case of *Brandy v. Owners of s.s. Raphael* (27 T. L. R. 127), which we discussed fully at the time it was decided, a stoker in the merchant service, who was also a reservist in the Royal Naval Reserve, was held to be employed under two "concurrent contracts of service," and entitled to add his naval retaining fee to his mercantile service wage in assessing the amount of his compensation. The case is well worth reading, because of the extremely fine discussions which arose in argument as to the nature of "service," the precise scope of "contract," and the connotation to be attached to "concurrent" for the purposes of this statute. An almost equally nice series of points, relating, however, to concurrent benefits and not to concurrent contracts, arose in the case of *McDermott (Pauper) v. s.s. Tintoretto* (27 T. L. R. 149), where the question at issue was whether or not a seaman who, under the Merchant Shipping Acts, is entitled to be paid his wages up to the port of discharge, could keep those wages as well as receive compensation for an accident from a date prior to such arrival.

But the most interesting cases under the Act are undoubtedly those which explain the meaning of an accident "arising out of and in the course of his employment," and here seamen have made many noted cases. A seaman, ashore on business of his ship, falls into the dock on his way back and is drowned; this is an accident arising out of, and in the course of his employment: *Jones v. Owner of ship Alice and Eliza* (3 Butterworth W. C. Cases 495). Again, a seaman, ashore to purchase personal necessities, has a similar accident; he also is within the Act, because the purchase of personal necessities makes him a more efficient sailor, and therefore is in the course of his duty to his employers: *Moore (Pauper) v. Manchester Liners (Limited)* (3 Butterworth W. C. Cases 527). But Lords MACNAGHTEN and MERSEY dissented in the latter case; and certainly the logic-chopping is rather fine. On the other hand, a ship's fireman goes on shore for his own pleasure one Sunday, and on returning is drowned; he is not within the Act, for what he has done is in no way for the benefit, direct or indirect, of his employers: *Kelly v. Foam Queen* (3 Butterworth 113). Again, a master who left his ship and went to a hotel about one hundred yards from a quay, returned next morning, and hailed his ship for a boat; before it reached him, he had fallen over the quayside and was drowned; he is not within the Act, because there was no evidence whether his presence on shore related to the ship's business or his own, and on him is the burden of proof: *Hewitt v. The ship Duchess* (3 Butterworth 239). The same measure is meted out to a sailor who goes ashore for dinner—which he could have had on board—and gets drowned

on his way back; he owed no duty to his employer to dine on shore: *Gilbert v. Owners of The Nizam* (3 Butterworth 455).

If the reader is disposed to say that there is some wondrously subtle logic in all the above distinctions, he will probably be quite dumfounded by another, which is even more extraordinary. A seaman, ashore on his own business, not his employer's, and, therefore, not in the course of his employment, returns, and places one foot on the ship's rail; he falls off, and is drowned. Held, that he is entitled to compensation, for he has returned to and resumed his employment—the resumption occurred the moment he got on the ladder (*Canavan v. s.s. Universal*, 3 Butterworth 355). Had he fallen in a moment before, he would have been outside his employment, and disentitled!

There is another little group of interesting cases, four in number, which relate to a cognate point—namely, the inference to be drawn in the case of an "unexplained death." The first of these cases in point of time is *Rice v. Swansea Vale* (3 Butterworth 152). There a seaman while on watch fell overboard; there was no evidence to show how he fell—he might have had an accident or committed suicide or been murdered. The Court held that *prima facie* he must be presumed to be doing his duty, and therefore the correct inference was that he had perished by an accident; he was awarded compensation. The next case in point of time, *Hewitt v. Ship Duchess* (quoted *supra*), was decided in the reverse way. The master of *The Duchess* went on shore, and fell into the water as he returned, no one seeing the accident. Had there been evidence that he went on shore to do the ship's business, he would have been "in the course of his employment" when he met with the accident, and the presumption of law would be that he met it in the course of his duty. Since, however, his going ashore might have been either for pleasure or on business, there was no presumption that he was doing his duty when he returned, and therefore no presumption of an accident. Hence he had not discharged the burden of proof, and was not entitled to compensation. In the third case, *Marshall v. Wild Rose* (3 Butterworth 514), a sailor went on deck to get fresh air one night, and disappeared. It was held (Lords LOREBURN and JAMES dissenting) that there was no evidence as to how he met his death, and that the presumption of accident could not be drawn. This case was distinguished from our first case, *The Swansea Vale*, by the fact that there the sailor was on watch, here he was off duty, when the unexplained death occurred. Therefore, the presumption as to the cause of disappearance is different; in the first case he is presumed to die while doing his duty, in the other case there is no such presumption. In the fourth case, *Moore (Pauper) v. Manchester Liners* (*supra*), the seaman had gone ashore to purchase personal necessities, and therefore his unexplained death was held to arise while he was doing his duty to his employers, so as to be an accident which entitled him to compensation. Thus it would seem that it is a sailor's duty to his employers to buy personal necessities, but no part of his duty to get a breath of fresh air at night! The true explanation of the last two cases—which immediately succeeded each other in the House of Lords—is that the House was differently composed on the two occasions, and that on the second occasion the judges who had dissented in the first case were reinforced by a colleague who took the same view. The practitioner is, therefore, in some doubt as to which will ultimately be regarded as an authority.

Reviews.

Mercantile Law.

MERCANTILE LAW. By D. F. DE L'HOSTE RANKING, M.A., LL.D., and ERNEST EVAN SPICER, F.C.A., and ERNEST E. PEGLER, F.C.A., of the Firm of Spicer & Pegler, Chartered Accountants. H. Foulkes Lynch & Co.

In this volume the subject of mercantile law is treated in a popular manner. It is, the authors say in the opening chapter, perhaps one of the most surprising features of trade and commerce "that so many persons engaged in it are daily making contracts, and acquiring rights and taking liabilities under such contracts, without being aware in the slightest degree of the law governing their actions." For the

benefit of such persons the elements of the law of contract and of other branches of mercantile law are explained, and illustrations are given from the reports. There is, for instance, in the discussion of the essentials of a contract a reference to *Carlill v. Carbolic Smoke Ball Co.* (1893, 1 Q. B. 256), which settled that an offer made to the public by advertisement does not require specific notification of acceptance, but is turned into a contract by the performance of the condition. The chapter on Sale of Goods is of course based on the Sale of Goods Act, 1893, and contains, among other matter, a useful statement of the requirements of section 4, corresponding to section 17 of the Statute of Frauds; and the chapter on Suretyship and Guarantees distinguishes between guaranties, for which a memorandum in writing is necessary, and indemnities, which are outside the statute. There are chapters also on Insurance, Bailments, Carriage, Merchant Shipping, Securities, and other matters, and a glossary of mercantile terms and legal maxims. The sections on priority of shipping mortgages, which give the provisions of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, should, in accordance with the scheme of the rest of the book, contain references to the leading cases, but these are wanting. This book will be useful as an elementary manual.

Announcements.

AMONG the many works we have recently announced as about to be published, we have been surprised to see no reference to a contemplated reissue of Wolstenholme's Conveyancing and Settled Land Acts, the ninth edition of which appeared in 1905. This is a most valuable work for the conveyancer, and the admirable notes by the eminent author should not be allowed to pass into oblivion.

Books of the Week.

Libel and Slander.—A Digest of the Law of Libel and Slander and of Actions on the Case for Words causing Damage. With the Evidence, Procedure, Practice and Precedents of Pleadings, both in Civil and Criminal Cases. By W. BLAKE ODGERS, M.A., LL.D., K.C. Fifth Edition. By THE AUTHOR, J. BROMLEY EAMES, M.A., B.C.L., and WALTER BLAKE ODGERS, M.A., Barristers-at-Law. Stevens & Sons (Limited).

Private Bill Legislation.—Municipal Origins. An Account of English Private Bill Legislation relating to Local Government 1740-1835, with a Chapter on Private Bill Procedure. By FREDERICK H. SPENCER, LL.B. With a Preface by Sir EDWARD CLARKE, K.C. 10s. 6d. net. Constable & Co. (Limited).

Criminal Appeal.—Criminal Appeal Cases. Reports of Cases in the Court of Criminal Appeal, July 3rd, 1911. Edited by HERMAN COHEN, Barrister-at-Law. Vol. VI., Part IX. Stevens & Haynes.

Correspondence.

Land Valuation and Ground Rents.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter.]

Sir,—I enclose (omitting formal parts) copies of letters exchanged with the Secretary to the Inland Revenue.

From these letters it appears that where, in the case of ground rents, the reversion is of no value, the original site values now being ascertained by the district valuers can be accepted without demur, as it is unlikely that any increment value duty will be payable on the sale by the present owner.

13, Walbrook, E.C., Sept. 14.

The following is the correspondence referred to:—

4th August, 1911.

To the Secretary, Land Valuation Department.

In connection with this estate, which comprises numerous ground rents all over London, having in most cases considerable terms to run, we are informed by district valuers, "that in ordinary circumstances, upon the sale of these ground rents, where the lease was outstanding for a term of say forty years or more, the Commissioners would be advised to accept as the site value the site value fixed on the last previous occasion, or if there had been no previous occasion, the original site value."

We should be glad to know whether we can accept the principle mentioned in this statement as a general one in ordinary circumstances, for if so it will save our clients considerable trouble and expense in dealing with provisional valuations.

Copy Letter from the Inland Revenue.

13th September, 1911.

FINANCE (1909-10) ACT, 1910.

In reply to your letter of the 4th ult., I am directed by the Commissioners of Inland Revenue to acquaint you that the statement alleged to have been made by the district valuers respecting the sale of "ground

rents where the lease was outstanding for a term of say forty years or more," referred only to the particular property which was then under consideration.

I am to point out that the transfer of a reversionary interest with the ground rent incident thereto is the transfer of an interest in land, not a transfer of the fee simple, which, for the purposes of Part I of the above Act, is defined to mean "the fee simple in possession not subject to any lease."

On the occasion of the transfer on sale of such an interest, therefore, the value of the fee simple has to be calculated on the basis of the portion, if any, of the consideration attributable to the reversionary interest as distinct from the ground rent, and the "occasion" site value is ascertained by making the deductions authorized by the latter part of section 2 (2).

You are no doubt aware that when valuing ground rents, it is, under normal circumstances, the practice not to include any additional reversionary value if the reversion is deferred for a long period, and consequently, upon the sale of such a ground rent where these circumstances exist, no increment value duty would be payable.

[See observations under head of "Current Topics."—Ed. S.J.]

Rules of the Supreme Court (July), 1911.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter.]

Sir,—When these rules were in draft, I never thought that Rule 12, requiring Chancery orders to be drawn up and entered in fourteen days, would be allowed to pass, and can hardly believe it was drawn by anyone having a full knowledge of the practice, and the difficulties in getting orders through at the registrars' seats. First, it usually takes about a week to get the draft order, and there goes at once seven days of the time allowed by the rule; this seven days is taken up by first obtaining counsel's brief, which at the earliest can only be got on the following day of the making of the order; this is taken to the registrar's seat, and in due course goes to the registrar's chief clerk, who drafts the order. The time it is with him depends upon whether he is busy or not, and the nature and difficulties of the order. It then goes to the stationer for drafts to be made for the solicitors, and they might be ready in twenty-four hours. The drafts when made go to the registrars, some of whom make a practice of going through them before handing out to the solicitors, and it is a frequent answer, when applying for draft, that the registrar is looking through it, which he can only do, of course, while in his room or in court and subject to the usual interruptions.

When at last the solicitor gets the draft, he applies for an appointment to settle (which must be one clear day's notice), to be told very often that the registrar is in court for the next three days, and herein lies a good deal of the cause of the delay. If the registrar's rota is referred to it will be seen that it is quite common for registrars to be in court three days in succession, and if you take in the emergency rota, it might be four or five days in succession. What is wanted is more registrars.

From the above one can quite see that the fourteen days under the new rule may easily be used up in obtaining and settling the above order; then it has to be engrossed, and if it is a paymaster's order, it has to be printed—first, a blue print, which will probably take two days to get, then examined and left for white print, then (in either printed or written orders), if an appointment to pass is necessary, another possibility of the registrar being in court for three days or more.

The rule is absurd, as any solicitor's managing clerk would tell you—solicitors would only be too glad to get their orders through, but the delay is not with them, but at the registrars' seats. It is not the fault of the registrars themselves, but of their system, and as by the new rule it is compulsory for them to report every case to the judge (where the time is exceeded), they will have enough to do. If a rule of this nature was necessary, it would have been sufficient for the registrar to report any case where the solicitors were responsible for the delay. As it is now, he has to report all cases, and if it is not the fault of the solicitors he will have to say whose fault it is; and if it is the fault of the system it is hoped he will say so, and see whether the Rule Committee will suggest a remedy. Chancery orders are often important documents, and cannot be rushed through, and moreover, often have to be submitted, in agency cases, to the country client.

C. J. SKINNER.

11, Maiden-lane, Queen-street, Cheapside, London, Sept. 16.

[See our observations on Rule 12, *ante*, pp. 561, 574, 594 and 677. It does not appear that the attention of the Council of the Law Society has been directed to the operation of the rule.—Ed. S.J.]

Transfers of Mortgages.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter.]

Sir,—There is one point with regard to the transfer of a mortgage which does not seem to be dealt with in the books.

Where the borrower joins in the transfer, inquiry is naturally made of him as to whether there have been any dealings with the equity of redemption. But the borrower's answer to this requisition is in the nature of an *ex parte* statement, and there may possibly be a duty on the transferee to inquire also of the mortgagee whether he has received notice of any such dealings. The transferee may have no actual notice of any dealing with the equity of redemption; but might he not be fixed with constructive notice of a dealing which inquiries of the mortgagee would have revealed?

If the transferee obtains the legal estate (as he would in the case of a first mortgage), it would seem probable that he has not been guilty of such gross negligence as would take away his advantage of having the legal estate. On the other hand, the matter is by no means so clear in the case of the transferee of a second mortgage (who obtains merely an equitable interest), inasmuch as he purchases subject to all existing equities.

Another question arises as to whether the mortgagee would be obliged to answer such an inquiry, since his position would seem to be much the same as that of a trustee asked by a proposed mortgagee of a beneficiary's interest for information with regard to charges on that interest.

Perhaps one of your readers can enlighten me.

London, Sept. 13.

LECTOR.

Double Taxation.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter.]

Sir,—There is a very common error in your Note on Double Taxation on p. 762 of your issue of the 16th inst., where you state that a person residing here has to pay the tax on his entire income wherever arising, notwithstanding that part may be produced in a British colony, &c., &c.

This statement is, of course, in direct contradiction of *Colquhoun v. Brooks* (1889, App. Cas. 493), where the House of Lords decided that profits on a trade carried on by a person resident in the United Kingdom, elsewhere than in the United Kingdom, are not assessable until received by such resident here. The case is decisive of the point, as Mr. Brooks had part of the profits made in Australia remitted here and paid tax on them, but the taxing authority failed to get the income tax on the part of the profits left in Australia.

Mr. Asquith made a similar mis-statement to yours in the House of Commons. I immediately wrote to him pointing out his error, but my letter was not acknowledged, nor did he make any correction in the House that I saw reported.

E. T. HARGRAVES.

52, Coleman-street, E.C., Sept. 18.

[See observations under head of "Current Topics."—Ed. S.J.]

Sharpe v. Haggith.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter.]

Sir,—Referring to your paragraph in this week's SOLICITORS' JOURNAL—"Set-Off or Counterclaim"—we beg to inform you we have set down an appeal from the judgment of Lord Coleridge, and that it will come on in due course.

The plaintiff's contention is that judgment ought to have been entered for £50 with costs on the claim, and for £90 15s. 9d. with costs on the counterclaim, as pointed out in your paragraph. We may add that the hearing of the claim lasted over two days, while the counterclaim, being admitted, was scarcely mentioned.

ABBOTT & HUDSON,

9, Fenchurch-street, Sept. 18.

Solicitors for the Plaintiff.

[We were, of course, not aware, at the time of our observations, that an appeal had been entered.—Ed. S.J.]

Points to be Noted.

Conveyancing and Equity.

Building Society—Mortgage by Way of Trust—Statute of Limitations—Acknowledgment.—When a member of a building society, having borrowed money from the society, executes a deed conveying property to the society upon trust to permit him to receive the rents until he makes default in repayment of the advance, and then to enter and take possession, and the deed contains a power of sale, then the deed is a mortgage, although in form a conveyance upon trusts. The Real Property Limitation Act, 1874, applies from the date of taking possession under it. The statutory yearly accounts published by the society, mentioning the possession of the property by the society as mortgagees, are not acknowledgments of the member's title so as to prevent

the statute from running.—**RE METROPOLIS AND COUNTIES PERMANENT INVESTMENT BUILDING SOCIETY: GATFIELD'S CASE** (Neville, J., March 2) (1911, 1 Ch. 698).

Long Lease—Breach of Repairing Covenant—Waste—Relief against Forfeiture.—An act of waste, such as altering the character of a building, may be a breach of a repairing covenant; and a breach of a repairing covenant may result in forfeiture of the lease. Relief may be given against forfeiture under section 14 of the Conveyancing Act, 1881; but relief will not be given from the consequences of these acts of waste unless the tenant is willing to make good the waste and to observe the covenant in the future.—**ROSE v. SPICER. ROSE v. HYMAN** (C.A., March 31) (55 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 405; 1911, 2 K.B., 234).

Administration—Legacy to Debtor—Partnership Debt.—It is a principle of administration that a debtor legatee is not to be paid his legacy until he has brought into account the amount of the debt. But this rule does not apply against a legatee who is a member of a partnership firm and indebted only as a partner.—**TURNER v. TURNER** (C.A., March 31), (1911, 1 Ch. 716).

Administration—Right of Executor to Pledge Personal Chattels.—An executor remains all his life an executor, unless removed under the Judicial Trustees Act, 1896, and he has (even if he be only one of several executors) a right to pledge personal chattels in his hands which does not cease when all the testator's known debts are paid. The pledgee is not bound to inquire whether the pledgor is an executor, and the pledge is good even if made for private ends. The date when an executor becomes a trustee is not the end of his executorship.—**SOLOMON v. ATTENBOROUGH** (Joyce, J., May 20) (55 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 535; 1911, 2 Ch. 159).

Settled Land Act, 1882—Capital Moneys—Damages under a Lease for Dilapidations.—Damages recovered by a life tenant of a settled estate from a lessee, for dilapidations arising from breach of a repairing covenant, are not capital moneys payable to the settlement trustees or into court. They are the life tenant's own money, representing the damage which he has sustained. (Decision of Swinfen Eady, J., noted 55 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 496, reversed).—**RE LACON'S SETTLEMENT: LACON v. LACON** (C.A., May 26) (55 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 551; 1911, 2 Ch. 17).

Power of Appointment—Appointment by Will Equally among a Class—Satisfaction.—An appointment of a fund by will equally among A, B, C, and D is satisfied, as regards A and B, by a subsequent appointment of proportionate parts of the fund to A and B by deed.—**RE PEEL'S SETTLEMENT: BIDDULPH v. PEEL** (Joyce, J., June 2) (55 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 580; 1911, 2 Ch. 165).

CASES OF LAST SITTINGS.

Court of Appeal.

REX v. COMMISSIONER OF METROPOLITAN POLICE. Ex parte HOLLOWAY. No. 2. 29th July.

METROPOLIS—CABS—LICENCE TO PLY FOR HIRE—DISCRETION OF COMMISSIONER OF POLICE—METROPOLITAN PUBLIC CARRIAGE ACT, 1869 (32 & 33 VICT. c. 115), ss. 6, 11—ORDER as to HACKNEY AND STAGE CARRIAGES OF 1907.

Under the Metropolitan Carriage Act, 1869, and the order made by the Secretary of State on the 30th of December, 1907, under sections 6 and 11 of that Act, the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis has no discretion to refuse licences for cabs or stage carriages to ply for hire within the Metropolitan Police area in cases that do not come within sub-paragraphs (a) and (b) of clause 2 of the order.

This was an appeal from a decision of the Divisional Court, which, by a majority (Lord Alverstone, C.J., and Lawrence, J., Darling, J., dissentiente), had ordered the discharge of a rule nisi addressed to the Commissioner of Metropolitan Police, calling on him to show cause why a writ of *mandamus* should not issue commanding him to grant a cab licence, or to hear and determine the application therefor according to law. The appeal raised the question of the correctness of the decision in *Rez v. Commissioner of Police, Ex parte Pearce* (1911, 80 L. J., K. B. 223), that the Commissioner of Police had a discretion in all cases as to the granting of licences for cabs or stage carriages to ply for hire within the Metropolitan Police area.

The Metropolitan Public Carriage Act, 1869 (32 & 33 VICT. c. 115), provides by section 6 for the granting by a Secretary of State of licences to hackney and stage carriages.

The order of the 30th of December, 1907, made by the Secretary of State, which took the place of a previous order, dated the 10th of March, 1871, provided as follows:—

In pursuance of sections 6 and 11 of the Metropolitan Public Carriage Act, 1869, I hereby prescribe as follows:—

1. A licence for a cab or stage carriage may be granted to any person by the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis, hereinafter

referred to as the Commissioner, subject to the following exceptions: (a) A licence shall not be granted to any person under the age of twenty-one years, and any licence so granted shall be void. (b) The Commissioner may, at his discretion, refuse a licence to any person who has been convicted of a felony, misdemeanour, or of cruelty to animals, or who, having previously held a licence for a cab or a stage carriage, has had such previous licence revoked or suspended.

2. A person desirous of obtaining a licence for a cab or a stage carriage shall make application at the office of the Commissioner.

Such application, if for a cab licence, shall be in the form contained in schedule A hereto . . .

3. The price of a licence for a cab or a stage carriage is £2.

4. If the application is approved by the Commissioner, the applicant shall pay the said sum of £2 to the receiver for the Metropolitan Police District, or to some person whom such receiver shall appoint, who shall issue to the applicant a receipt for the amount paid.

7. A licence (subject to the conditions hereinafter specified) shall thereupon be issued to the applicant.

The question as to the general discretion of the Commissioner not being open to the Divisional Court, they held, by a majority, that he had exercised his discretion properly in the particular case in refusing the licence. From this decision the applicant appealed.

THE COURT (COZENS-HARDY, M.R., and FARWELL and KENNEDY, L.J.J.) allowed the appeal.

COZENS-HARDY, M.R.—Three grounds for appeal are alleged in the present case. The first is that the Commissioner has not a general discretion to grant or refuse licences. I have arrived at the conclusion that the appeal ought to be allowed on this first ground, and I do not therefore propose to deal with the other grounds. The Commissioner of Police has authority given to him, under the order of the 30th of December, 1907, by the Secretary of State; in one case (a) he must not grant a licence, in another case (b) he may refuse a licence. I think that the maxim *expressio unius exclusio alterius* applies, and that is inconsistent with the Commissioner having a discretion in all cases. I desire to adopt the observations of Lush, J., in *Ex parte Randall* (27 T. L. R. 505): "If it had not been for the decision in *Ex parte Pearce* (*supra*) I confess I should have felt some hesitation in coming to the conclusion that the Commissioner of Police has the very wide discretion which Mr. Scott says he has. He derives his power to grant or withhold licences entirely from the mandate given to him by the Secretary of State, who obtains his power to give such mandate from section 6 of the Metropolitan Carriage Act, 1869." It may be observed that the Commissioner, in the regulations which have been laid down by the Secretary of State, and upon which the Commissioner acts, is told by clause 1 (b) that he may in certain specified instances in his discretion refuse a licence. It does seem to me that there might have been considerable force in the contention that it is an erroneous view to take of that sub-paragraph to say that it means that the Commissioner may, in his discretion, if he thinks fit, refuse a licence. I have considered, with the respect due to the learned judges who decided *Ex parte Pearce* (*supra*), whether that decision can really be considered sound. Lord Alverstone, L.C.J., in that case took the view that the order did intend to give the Commissioner a discretion in granting a licence, but he did not notice any passage either in the Act of Parliament or in the order which gave him the unlimited discretion that was claimed. Pickford, J., took the view that by virtue of section 11 the Commissioner was substituted for the Secretary of State, and must have the same power and discretion as the Secretary of State had under section 6. With that view I cannot agree. It is too plain for argument that the Commissioner cannot make regulations, but can only adopt the conditions prescribed by the Secretary of State. I am of opinion that under the order the Commissioner has not the discretion which he claims in cases not falling within sub-paragraphs (a) or (b). "That being so, the *mandamus* ought to go, and the appeal must be allowed."

FARWELL and KENNEDY, L.J.J., delivered judgments to the same effect.—**COUNSEL, Sonkey, K.C., and R. J. White; Duckworth, K.C., and G. A. Scott. SOLICITORS, Julius A. White; Wontner & Son.**

[Reported by J. I. STELLING, Barrister-at-Law.]

New Orders, &c.

Indictable Offences Act, 1848.

COSTS IN PROCEEDINGS.

The following circular has been issued by the Home Office:—

Home Office, Whitehall,
31st July, 1911.

"Sir,—

1. I am directed by the Secretary of State to inform you that his attention has been called by the Director of Public Prosecutions and other persons to questions arising under the Costs in Criminal Cases Act, 1908, on which an expression of his opinion may be of assistance to magistrates in dealing with indictable cases.

2. I am in the first place to point out that the Director of Public Prosecutions is in the same position, in respect of the allowance of costs from county or borough funds, as any private prosecutor.

3. The provisions for the payment of a prosecutor's costs out of local funds are expressly declared by section 2 (4) of the Prosecution of Offences Act, 1908, to apply to the Director of Public Prosecutions, in the same way as to any private prosecutor.

4. By the financial arrangements made at the time of the passing of the Local Government Act, 1888, the costs of prosecutions fall on local funds—the grants in aid of these costs, which were formerly made by the Treasury, having been discontinued, with other similar grants, in consideration of the large amount of revenue from Imperial taxes, which was devoted by the Act to the relief of local rates.

5. As the Director conducts prosecutions, by his staff, or through his agents, in all parts of the country, he has a wide and varied experience of the diversity of practice which exists in regard of the payment of costs; and while it is the general rule that magistrates are ready to give a certificate for the payment from local funds of the reasonable costs of a solicitor conducting a case before them, prior to its committal for trial, it appears that difficulty is sometimes experienced in obtaining one, even in cases where the solicitor's services have been most necessary for putting the evidence fully and clearly before the court, and where it would be unreasonable to expect the police, or anyone not having legal qualifications, to conduct the proceedings unaided.

6. The Secretary of State does not appreciate the reasons which give rise to this difficulty. The employment of a solicitor is often necessary not only to save the time of the court, but to present the true facts, and so to prevent miscarriage of justice, or to assist in considering any points of law which may arise. Moreover, the needs of the case must not be judged by the actual proceedings before the justices alone. Regard must also be had to the preliminary work done out of court by the persons responsible for the conduct of the prosecution. This work is often of a difficult, prolonged, and costly character.

7. The Secretary of State is of opinion that, when the magistrates are satisfied that the employment of a solicitor has resulted in a difficult or complicated case being put before them in a manner which has assisted them to come to a decision, or that it would not have been right to permit or expect the police or a private prosecutor to present the case unassisted, it is their duty to issue a certificate, in pursuance of section 1 and section 3 of the Costs in Criminal Cases Act.

8. The amount of the costs to be included in such a certificate is a matter as to which the Secretary of State does not, as at present advised, feel able to lay down any general rule—but he thinks that the language of section 1 of the Act previously referred to might very properly be taken as a guide.

9. The cases taken up by the Director of Public Prosecutions are usually of special importance, or of a specially difficult nature, and in some instances the duty of prosecuting is imposed upon the Director by statute. Where this is so, certificates for costs should, in the Secretary of State's opinion, be issued without hesitation, and it seems to him that the amounts allowed in respect of them might be taken by justices as a useful guide in determining the smaller amount to be allowed to a private prosecutor in a less important, or a less difficult, prosecution.

10. At the same time, the Secretary of State would urge that in cases where the Director is unable to undertake the conduct of a prosecution, the magistrates should give full consideration to the difficulties that may be found by a private prosecutor in putting his case in a businesslike way before them, and should not refuse to grant him a certificate for his costs, unless they are of opinion that the services of a solicitor were not necessary, having regard to the nature of the case and the position of the prosecutor. This applies whether the prosecution is conducted by the police or is in the hands of a private prosecutor.

11. There may, of course, be cases where magistrates may not feel justified in issuing a certificate for costs, although they have been actually incurred by prosecutors. In such cases, Mr. Churchill would suggest that they should state fully and clearly the reasons that induced them to refuse to grant certificates, in order that the grounds of their decision may be available as a guide to action in future prosecutions before them.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
EDWARD TROUP.

Societies.

The Law Society.

The following programme has been settled by the Council of the Law Society for the Nottingham provincial meeting:—

TUESDAY, 26TH SEPTEMBER, 1911, at 10.30 a.m., in the University College, Shakespeare-street, Nottingham.—The proceedings will commence with the president's address, after which the following papers will be read:—"The Relations of Labour and Law," Dixon H. Davies (London); "The Poor Man's Lawyer," H. Greenwood Wrigley (Manchester); "The Tyranny of Officialdom," James W. Reid (London); "The National Insurance Bill: Some Legal Aspects," H. Kingley Wood (London); "Profession, Practice and Press," T. Holmes Gore (Bristol).

WEDNESDAY, 27TH SEPTEMBER, 1911, at 11 a.m., in the University College, Shakespeare-street, Nottingham.—"An Imperial School of

Law," Walter G. Hart, LL.D. (London); "The Land Transfer 'Scandal,'" J. S. Rubinstein (London); "Proposed Amendments in the Law relating to County Courts," Thomas Marsden (Blackburn); "On the Desirability of giving Better Facilities to Claimants as Heirs-at-law or Next-of-kin," G. E. Moser (Kendal); "His Majesty's Commission of the Peace," J. A. Howard-Watson, F.R.G.S. (Liverpool); "The Maritime Conventions," Sandford D. Cole (Bristol); "Women: And the Unfair Position which they occupy at the Present Time; from a Legal Point of View; and a Few Suggestions as to where the Law should be Altered or Extended," J. W. F. Jacques (Bristol).

The President may make such alteration in the order of the papers as he may think convenient.

Law Students' Journal.

The Joint Board of Legal Education for Wales.

The first annual meeting of the Joint Board of Legal Education for Wales was held at Llandrindod Wells, on Saturday in last week, Mr. R. S. Cleaver (Liverpool) presiding.

The officers of the Board were unanimously re-elected for the session 1911-12, viz.:—Mr. R. S. Cleaver, president; Alderman Lewis Morgan, vice-president; Mr. E. W. Jones (Swansea), treasurer; Mr. D. Lleufer Thomas, hon. secretary. The following were co-opted members of the Board:—Mr. H. W. Spowart (Llanelli), Mr. G. L. Stokes, jun. (Tenby), Mr. William George (Criccieth), Mr. Francis Nunn (Colwyn Bay). The executive committee was appointed as follows:—Mr. Llewelyn Jones, Mr. A. C. Mackintosh, Mr. Dauncey, Mr. Hopley Pierce, Principal Roberts, Mr. G. F. Colbourne, Mr. W. W. Meredith, the officers to serve *ex officio*.

The meeting approved of a statement setting forth an application to be submitted to the Council of the Law Society in accordance with provisions of a scheme adopted in 1910 for the establishment of the board in association with the Law Society and the University of Wales in its constituent colleges. The statement dealt with the provision of legal education during 1911-12, and appealed for a special grant from the Council. It was realised that the grant made in September last to South Wales was in advance for 1911-12, and before the Joint Board came into existence, the first meeting of the latter being held in April, 1911. Consequently other centres desirous of establishing legal teaching for the current year had been prejudiced through no fault of their own. As a result of correspondence between the Joint Board and the Swansea Board, the latter, with the approval of the Law Society, had paid over to the Joint Board the grant of £200 received by them on condition that the number of lectures to be given at Swansea in 1911-12 should be not fewer than in previous years, and that the summer course at Aberystwith should be continued. Further, the Aberystwith and Swansea centres guaranteed the sum of £121 and the Cardiff centre about £100, which, with the Law Society's grant of £200, makes an approximate total of £420, thus enabling the board, in addition to continuing the instruction previously given at the Aberystwith and Swansea centres, to provide for courses of law lectures during 1911-12 at Cardiff.

Obituary.

Mr. T. G. Gibson.

Mr. Thomas George Gibson, of Newcastle-on-Tyne, solicitor, died on Saturday last, in his eighty-second year. He served his articles with his uncle, the late Mr. G. T. Gibson, of Newcastle, and subsequently for some years practised on his own account in London. In 1865, however, he succeeded to the practice of his uncle in Newcastle; and some years later took into partnership his brother, Mr. J. F. Gibson, and Mr. Robert Pybus. Mr. J. F. Gibson afterwards quitted the firm, and Mr. John Pybus became a partner. The style of the firm is now Gibson, Pybus, and Pybus. Mr. Gibson took an active part in municipal matters. He was elected a member of the City Council in 1871, and an Alderman in 1886; was Sheriff of Newcastle in 1882, and Mayor of the city in the following year. In 1903 he resigned his position on the City Council, having served as a member for nearly thirty-two years. He was indefatigable in promoting the interests of the Newcastle-on-Tyne Incorporated Law Society, of which he was honorary secretary for nearly nineteen years, and was no fewer than five times elected president. Mr. Gibson's public benefactions were numerous; he is said to have contributed £12,000 to the College of Physical Science at Newcastle, and £5,000 to the new Infirmary in that city. The *Newcastle Daily Journal* reports a sermon delivered in Newcastle Cathedral, in which Canon Gough said that Mr. Gibson was "one to whom the Church and that diocese owed, perhaps, more than to any man of this generation. Thomas George Gibson was one before whom no good cause concerning the house of God was ever laid in vain. He was a generous contributor to the Chapter Endowment Fund, and recently to their Organ Restoration Fund; while the Cathedral Nursing Association and the Diocesan House of Mercy were indebted to him not only for financial aid, but for personal service as chairman of the one and vice-chairman of the other."

Sir W. J. Farrer.

Sir William James Farrer died on Sunday last, in his ninetyeth year. He was descended from an old Yorkshire family—the Farrers, of Clapham, near Ingleborough—and was the son of Mr. Thomas Farrer and brother of the late Lord Farrer. We have no information as to his education or articles, but he was admitted in 1849, and carried on business at No. 66, Lincoln's Inn Fields, for many years in partnership with his brother, Mr. Frederick Willis Farrer, who retired in 1900 and died in 1909. Mr. W. J. Farrer was for a long time High Bailiff of the city of Westminster. He was, we believe, solicitor to the Grenadier Guards, and a director of the Law Life and Law Fire Insurance Societies. In 1887, on the occasion of the Jubilee of Queen Victoria, he received the honour of Knighthood, and then, or shortly before, he retired from practice. He was a magistrate for Berkshire and Middlesex; a Fellow of the Royal Geographical Society, the Society of Antiquaries, and the Geological Society.

Legal News.

Appointment.

Mr. G. R. ASKWITH, K.C., C.B., has received the honour of K.C.B. (Civil Division).

Changes in Partnerships, &c.

Dissolutions.

JOSEPH LISTER BOOTH and CECIL COOPER MILLIGAN, solicitors (J. Lister Booth & Milligan), Bradford and Leeds. Sept. 1. The said Joseph Lister Booth will henceforth practise on his own account at Bradford, and the said Cecil Cooper Milligan will henceforth practise on his own account at Leeds.

PERCY CHARLES RAY, CECIL FLOWER FLOWER-ELLIS, and ARTHUR POWELL SIMON, solicitors (Ray, Flower-Ellis, & Simon), 58, Margaret-street, Regent-street, London. Sept. 6. [Gazette, Sept. 19.]

General.

"They have," says the *Evening Standard*, "just put up a new statue to that well-known matron Justice over the extension of the Law Courts. It is in marble, and capable, it is to be hoped, of resisting the defilements of London air. That other statue of this good lady on the summit of the New Bailey is in a pitifully dirty condition, whether due to the exceptional heat or more normal causes we cannot tell. It does not look well, to say the least of it, to see this great Criminal Court presided over, externally, by tarnished Justice."

The *Times*, in an article on the work of the Ordnance Survey, says that maps of the whole country, in various styles, plain and coloured, are now obtainable on the scale of 15.782 miles, 10 miles, 4 miles, 2 miles, and 1 mile to the inch. The country has also been completely mapped on the large scale of six inches to the mile, showing every house, fence, and road, with contours. Finally the cultivated districts of Great Britain and most of Ireland are also shown on a series of maps on the still larger scale of 25 inches to the mile—about one square inch to the acre—giving the area of every field, and more heights above sea level than are shown in the 6-inch map, but without contours.

The Local Government Board have, says the *Times*, issued new regulations under section 10 of the Old Age Pensions Act, 1908, as amended by the Old Age Pensions Act, 1911. The new regulations supersede the regulations of 1908 and 1910, which are revoked. Some alterations are necessary in consequence of the new Act, and the opportunity has been taken to make a few other amendments in points of detail which experience of the administration of the Act of 1908 has shown to be necessary. As regards the conditions under which a pension officer is not bound to investigate a claim, the period of four months has now been extended to six months, and in order to obviate delay in dealing with claims provision has been made for the holding of adjourned meetings when a quorum of the committee is not present at an ordinary meeting.

Mr. W. J. H. Graham, Revising Barrister at Brompton, near Carlisle, says the *Evening Standard*, gave his decision in a test case argued before him jointly by the Liberal and Conservative agents for North Cumberland and North Westmoreland, on the point whether shooting rights by tenants over land could carry a Parliamentary vote. He said he had come to the conclusion that sporting rights were hereditaments capable of being separately dealt with and let, and not mere easements. A shooting tenant was getting just as much out of the land as a farmer who took his hay and corn. In his view the concurrent right to shoot rabbits created by the Ground Game Act made no difference to a sporting tenancy, and it was unnecessary for franchise purposes for a sporting tenant to have a legal document. He, therefore, decided that sporting rights carry Parliamentary votes.

Sir Charles Parsons, presiding at the first meeting of the Canadian Oil Producing and Refining Company, remarked, says the *Evening Standard*, that when the property was taken over three hundred documents had to be consulted for the verification of title.

The Legal Insurance Company have issued a very tastefully got up little book on "The Inns of Court," which contains an interesting account by Mr. Wilfred Rutherford, of the origin and early history of each of these bodies, their membership and customs.

An Indian judge, when first appointed to his position, says the *Bombay Gazette*, was not well acquainted with Hindustani. He was trying a case in which a Hindu was charged with stealing a "nilghai." The judge did not like to betray his ignorance of what a nilghai was, so he said, "Produce the stolen property." The court was held in an upper room, so the usher gasped, "Please your lordship, it's downstairs." "Then bring it up instantly!" sternly ordered the judge. The official departed, and a minute later a loud bumping was heard, mingled with loud and earnest exhortations. Nearer came the noise, the door was pushed open, and the panting official appeared dragging in the blue bull. The judge was dumfounded, but only for an instant. "Ah! That will do," said he. "It is always best, when possible, for the judge personally to inspect the stolen property. Remove the stolen property, usher."

At the Central Criminal Court on the 14th inst., says the *Times*, before Mr. Justice Avory, John Richard Coleman was charged on the coroner's inquisition with the murder of Frederick George Yardley. The grand jury had ignored the bill for murder and returned a true bill for manslaughter. Objection was taken by counsel for the prisoner to his being put on his trial for murder on the coroner's inquisition after the grand jury had thrown out the bill for murder. It was not illegal, but to allow the case to go on would be to reduce the work of the grand jury to a farce. In support of his contention counsel quoted from Archbold's Criminal Pleading (p. 159). Again, there were two differences in the names of the jurors as recorded in the body of the inquisition and in their signatures, and there was a further point as to the signature of the deputy-coroner. In the body of the inquisition it said "before Harry Bolton Sewell, Esq., deputy to Mr. Henry Robert Oswald, one of the coroners for our said lord the King for the said county of London." According to Archbold (p. 165), "Where the inquisition is taken before a deputy-coroner the proper mode of signing the attestation is 'R.D. (L.S.), coroner, by E.M., his deputy duly appointed.'" (*R. v. Perkins*, 7 Q. B. 165; 14 L. J. (M.C.), 87.) In this case the signature was simply "Harry Bolton Sewell, deputy-coroner," the word "deputy" being written in above "coroner," which was printed. That was not a sufficient signature. Mr. Justice Avory said that the coroner's inquisition could only be disposed of by a verdict of the jury, or by no evidence being offered, in which event the verdict of the jury was also taken. He thought the first objection failed. As regarded the third objection, he thought that it did sufficiently appear in the inquisition that the person holding the inquest was the deputy-coroner. As to the second objection, he saw no reason to doubt that John Blomberg, who signed the inquisition, was the "John Thomas Blomberg" appearing in the body of the inquisition. He could not doubt that the coroner, in the execution of his duty, saw that the persons who had to be sworn as jurymen and viewed the body were those who signed the inquisition. Therefore he overruled the objections. The trial was then proceeded with.

ROYAL NAVAL COLLEGE, OSBORNE.—For information relating to the entry of Cadets, Parents and Guardians should write for "How to Become a Naval Officer" (with an introduction by Admiral the Hon. Sir E. R. Fremantle, G.C.B., C.M.G.), containing an illustrated description of life at the Royal Naval Colleges at Osborne and Dartmouth.—Gieve, Matthews, & Seagrove, 65, South Molton-street, Brook-street, London, W. [ADVT.]

Winding-up Notices.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Sept. 15.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

BORNEO RUBBER AND TRADING CO., LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Oct. 28, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to John Baker, Eldon Street House, Eldon st. Curwen & Carter, Gray's Inn sq, solrs to the liquidator.

CANTARA ESTATES, LTD.—Petn for winding up, presented Sept. 11, directed to be heard Oct. 17. Robbins & Co, 218, Strand, for Wilding & Co, Blackburn, solrs for the petnr. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Oct. 16.

WARRINGTON STEEL FOUNDRY, LTD (IN LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before Oct. 16, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Arthur Taylor, 23, College hill, Cannon st. Greenop & Co, Bush Lane House Cannon st, solrs for the liquidator.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Sept. 19.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

AERIAL MANUFACTURING CO OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND, LTD.—Petn for winding up, presented Sept. 7, directed to be heard Oct. 17. F. Victor Robinson, 14, Bedford row, solrs for the petnr. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 9 o'clock in the afternoon of Oct. 16.

BEVAN LOCKETT CO. LTD.—Petn for winding-up, presented July 28, directed to be heard Oct 17. Flux & Co, 141, Leadenhall st, for Slater & Co, Darlaston, solors for the Petors. Notice of appearing must reach Flux & Co not later than six o'clock in the afternoon of Oct 16.

ELWICK AUTOCARS, LTD.—Petn for winding up, presented July 14, directed to be heard Oct 17. Miles & Co, 11, Green Victoria st, solors for the petors. Notice of appearing must be sent not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Oct 16.

JOHN MILLS AND CO. LTD.—Petn for winding-up, presented Sept 9, directed to be heard at the Court House, Half Acre, Brentford, Oct 11 at 10 o'clock. Blachoff & Co, 4, Great Winchester st, solors or the ptn. Notice of appearing must reach the above named not later than six o'clock in the afternoon of Oct 9.

MYERS (ACCRINGTON), LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Oct 9, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Edward Hope, 29, Willow st, Accrington Liquidator.

Resolutions for Winding-up Voluntarily.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, SEPT. 8.

BOLTON AND DISTRICT PROPERTY OWNERS' PROTECTION ASSOCIATION LTD.

CHESHIRE Calf MEAL CO. LTD.

STAMFORD, SPALDING AND BOSTON BANKING CO. LTD.

WESTERN OIL SYNDICATE, LTD. (Reconstruction).

GRIMSBY MODEL BAKERY CO. LTD.

WILLIAM SHAW (VICTORIA) LTD.

MAKWA TRANSSVAAL TIN LTD.

LACTIC FERMENTS, LTD.

Z. G. F. SYNDICATE, LTD.

MILLINERY MANUFACTURING CO. LTD.

PARADES DEVELOPMENT CO. LTD.

T. R. T. CONCESSIONS, LTD.

GOBBERTON GAS CO. LTD.

W. KILBURN, LTD.

"K. B." SYNDICATE, LTD.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, SEPT. 12.

BELL, PICCARD & CO. LTD.

WIENER CAFE, LTD.

YORKSHIRE PRESS, LTD.

HENRIQUEZ ESTATES, LTD. (Reconstruction).

F. BOYSE, LTD.

HENRIQUEZ SOUTH ROBBER ESTATES, LTD. (Reconstruction).

BRITISH COLUMBIA (ROSSLAND AND SLOCAN) SYNDICATE, LTD.

REDDESH BRICK TILE AND POTTERY CO. LTD.

LAYEK, LTD.

SOLICAWARE, LTD.

ANDREW AND THIEHNHAUS, LTD.

London Gazette.—WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 13.

HUTTOFT TOWN PLANNING SYNDICATE, LTD.

ANGLO-AUSTRIAN CONFECTIONERY CO. LTD.

ANGLO-MOREN OIL SYNDICATE, LTD.

GALIC STEAMSHIPS, LTD.

H. TOUNSON & CO. LTD.

ASHGATE COLLIERY CO. LTD.

SOUTHERN CHEMICALS, LTD.

WOODLAND COLLIERIES CO. LTD.

London Gazette.—THURSDAY, SEPT. 19.

GEORGE COLLE LTD.

LIVINGSTONE, MOIR AND CO., LTD.

TRIST FIANO FLAYER, LTD.

MONTHLY SYNDICATE, LTD.

WILKINSON, T. A. C. CO., LTD.

WILLIAM BRIGGS & CO (CENTURY DYEWORKS) LTD.

ECKERSALL AND ROTHWELL, LTD.

DAWFIELD, LTD.

CHARLES FOWNEND & CO. LTD.

TURTLE CUP, LTD.

BLACKPOOL WEEKLY, LTD.

WM. AND THOS. MAY, LTD.

LEEDS CITY GLASS WORKS CO. LTD.

BARTON-UNDER-NEEDWOOD GAS CO. LTD.

HAMLETT STATIONERY CO. LTD.

SIBAT SYNDICATE, LTD.

The Property Mart.

Result of Sale.

REVERSION AND LIFE POLICIES.

Messrs. H. E. FORTER & CRAWFIELD held their usual Fortnightly Sale, No. 939, of the above-named interests, at the Mart, Tokenhouse-yard, E.C.3, on Thursday last, when the following Lots were sold at the prices named, the total amount realized being £3,002:—

The REVERSION to £300 Ind's Stock	Sold £145
A POLICY OF ASSURANCE—						
For £2,000	" £2,000
For £500	" £35

Creditors' Notices.

Under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, SEPT. 15.

BALL, JAMES, Rochdale, Flock Merchant Nov 21 Thompson, Rochdale

BLAIR, ROBERT CUTHBERT, Abbottabad, North West Frontier, India Oct 11 Maddison & Co, Old Jewry

BURSILL, LOUISA, Hove, Sussex Nov 1 Stappole & Co, Union ct

DAVIS, ROBERT, Milverton, Somerset Oct 12 Kite & Co, Taunton

DAVIS, HARRIETT, Milverton, Somerset Oct 12 Kite & Co, Taunton

DEAR, JOHN, Baldock, Herts Oct 15 Reynolds & Miller, Basinghall st

DEKES, HARRY, THOMAS, Salisbury, Suffolk Nov 1 Steel & Stead, Sudbury

FLAXMAN, SAMUEL GEORGE, South Woodford, Essex Oct 20 Prestons, Stratford

GILMORE, MARY CAROLINE, Haywards Heath, Sussex Oct 24 Mercer, Chancery ln

HARDY, ELIZABETH I, Alvaston, Derby Oct 14 Briggs, Derby

HARPER, FRANCES ELIZABETH, Queensberry pl, South Kensington Oct 13 Freeman & Son, George st, Hanover sq

HAYMAN-JOYCE, JOHN, Eastbourne Oct 16 Coles & Co, Eastbourne

HODDER, ABRAHAM, Portland, Dorset Oct 12 Andrews & Co, Dorchester

HOPKIN, THOMAS, Ewenny, Glam Oct 15 Miles, Cowbridge, 80, Glam

HURRELL, ELIZABETH, Brighton Oct 1 Edgar & Co, Brighton

HUTCHINSON, THOMAS, Clitheroe, Lancs Oct 17 Holme, Clitheroe

IRELAND, ANN, Horsham, Sussex Oct 16 Coole & Haddock, Horsham

JERBOULT, CAROLINE, Taunton, Somerset Oct 12 Kite & Co, Taunton

JONES, WILLIAM, Llanfyllin, Montgomery Oct 20 Jones & Co, Fleet st

KAY, JAMES, Higher Bradshaw, nr Bolton Nov 1 Elston, Bolton

LEWIS, THOMAS, New Tredegar, Mon, Farmer Oct 16 Lewis & Co, Merthyr Tydfil

LIAS, MARY, Grange rd, Bermondsey Oct 9 Wilkinson, Bermondsey st

LOYD, DAVID, Swansea, Corn Merchant Oct 31 Collins & Woods, Swansea

MAKIN, SARAH, East Fulwood, Lancaster Oct 14 Turner & Sons, Preston

NORTHUMBERLAND, Most Noble ELHANOR, Dowager Duchess of, Darlington, York Oct 14 May & Co, Lincoln's inn fields

OLIVER, EDWARD, Glenloch rd, Haverstock Hill Oct 25 Brook, King's Bench walk, Temple

PEREIRA, EMILY, Upper Norwood, Surrey Oct 23 Farrer & Co, Lincoln's inn fields

REDHEAD, EDWARD, Wallasey, Northumberland Oct 31 Webb, Morpeth

ROBERTS, CHARLES ROBINS, Upper Tollington pk Oct 16 Rosaiter & Odell, Coleman st

ROBERTS, Mrs MARY ANNE, Southbourne, Hants Oct 31 Soames & Co, Lennox House, Norfolk st

ROBERTSON, MARGARET, Wallington, Surrey Oct 17 Bridgman & Co, College hill, Cannon st

TOMES, Mrs FANNY ROSETTA, Leamington Sept 29 Field & Sons, Leamington

WALL, MARIA SARAH, Kenilworth, Warwick Oct 29 Thomas & Co, Birmingham

WALTERS, WILLIAM, Swansea Oct 31 Collins & Woods, Swansea

WARD, ANNIE, Coombe rd, Sydenham Oct 3 Humphreys & Co, Cranbourn st, Charing Cross rd

WATTS, DAVID, Chesterton, Cambs Oct 31 Copley St Ives, Hants

WOODWARD, AMELIA ADAMS, Folkestone Oct 15 Manby & Brevitt, Wolverhampton

YOUNG, ROSALIND ADA, Hove, Sussex Oct 1 Eggar & Co, Brighton

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, SEPT. 19.

ARMITAGE, LUCIE, Winslade rd, Brixton Hill Oct 23 Heath & Eckersall, Cheltenham

BARKER, EMMA, Bournemouth Oct 7 Walker & Co, Theobald's rd

BATTERS, MARY ANN, Ilford, Essex Oct 16 Pettiver & Peakes, College hl

BERESFORD, Lieut-Gen MOSTYN DELA POER, East Molesey, Surrey Oct 15 Wordsworth & Co, Bloomsbury sq

BETH, JANETTE WILSON, Clifton, Bristol Sept 30 Page & Thompson, Bristol

BROOK, FRED, Elland, York, Stone Merchant Nov 1 Ayrtton, Brighouse

BURN, HELEN, Liverpool Nov 3 Rogers & Birkett, Liverpool

BURNETT, ALICE, South Shields Sept 24 Grunhut & Co, South Shields

CARR, ARTHUR, Blackpool, Builder Oct 23 Beech, Manchester

COX, MARIA GOODENOUGH, Staplegrave, nr Taunton Nov 15 Channer & Channer, Taunton

DUCK, EDWARD GEORGE, Bournemouth, Pianoforte Dealer Nov 6 Simmons & Co, Bath

FAULDING, ANN, Tenterden, Kent Oct 16 Sharp & Benest, Watling st

FAZAKERLEY, EDWARD, Liverpool Oct 16 Hannay & Horton, Liverpool

GOODMAN, HARRIS, Tipton, Stafford Oct 4 Hooper & Fairbairn, Dudley

GRISON, EDWARD SNAPE, Ashley pl, Westminster Oct 20 Allen & Son, Carlisle st, Soho sq

HAUGHTON, ELIZABETH SUSAN CELESTE DURANT, Holland rd, Kensington Oct 11 Procter, Helena chambers, Ealing

HIGHAM, HENRY, Mining ln, Coffes Broker Oct 31 Carpenter & Sons, 5, Laurence Pountney ln

HOLMES, GEORGE AUGUSTUS MORTIMER LEIGH, Glebe pl, Chelsea, Artist Oct 21 Barnard, York rd, Lambeth

HURST, ANN, Ot Haseley, Oxford Oct 23 Johnson, Oxford

JEFFES, ALICE, Stockton Heath, Chester Oct 7 Willett, Warrington

JEFFES, JOHN, Stockton Heath, Chester Sept 30 Willett, Warrington

JONES, ANN, Penarth, Glam Oct 15 Morgan & Co, Pontypridd

KENNEDY, JOHN, South Shields, Licensed Victualler Sept 28 Grunhut & Co, South Shields

KEYS, EMMA, Derby Oct 19 Sale, Derby

KEYS, THOMAS, Derby, Publican Oct 19 Sale, Derby

KINGSLEY, RICHARD, Hitchin, Herts Oct 14 Shillitoe, Hitchin

LEWIS, PHILIP, Bordesley, Birmingham Oct 21 Bickley & Lynner, Birmingham

LONGMIRE, JOHN, Sutton, Surrey Oct 24 Warburton, Gracechurch st

LONGLEY, EMMA, Stockton on Tees, Licensed Victualler Oct 20 Faber & Co, Stockton on Tees

LOVELL, ALFRED EDMUND, Ilford, Essex Nov 1 McKenna & Co, Basinghall st

MCKENNA, WILLIAM, Ellesmere Port, Chester Oct 14 Wilson, Liverpool

MILLER, MARY MARIA ELIZABETH Bishop's Hull, nr Taunton Nov 15 Channer & Channer, Taunton

MOORE, SARAH, King's gins, West Hampstead Nov 15 Guedalia & Jacobson, Wanchester House, Old Broad st

NEWTON, ISABEL OWEN, Ladybrand, Orange River Colony Oct 16 Brown & Co, Birmingham

PRICE, ELIZABETH, West Malvern, Worcester Oct 31 Russell & Co, Malvern

PROCTER, ELLEN Longton, Stoke on Trent Sept 30 Collis, Stoke on Trent

PROCTER, GEORGE, Longton, Stoke on Trent Sept 30 Collis, Stoke on Trent

RAINFORD, ANN, Shrewsbury Oct 31 Sprott & Morris, Shrewsbury

RAYNES-CROFT, EDWARD WILLIAM, JP, CSI, Torquay, Oct 20 Hext, Torquay

REED, JOHN HELLINS, Swansea Sept 27 Price, Swansea

SCOTT, EDMUND, Castle View, Greenhithe, Kent Oct 19 Scott, Dartford

SMITH, EMILY, Hendon, Middx Oct 21 Hobbs & Young, Brighton
STANDING, ELIZABETH, West Bowling, Bradford Oct 31 Wright & Co, Bradford
STARKIN, RICHARD STRINGER, Strand Oct 31 Hamlin & Co, Fleet st
SWANSTON, CHARLOTTE HANNAH, Swanston, Worthing Oct 15 Knapp-Fisher & Sons,
Buckingham gate, Westminster

VINE, MICHAEL, Hartland, Devon Oct 16 Hole & Co, Bide'ord
WALKER, HENRY, St Bridgets, Cumberland Oct 31 Atkinson & Bennett, Whit'haven
WARTNABY, HELEN, Brighton Oct 21 Hobbs & Young, Brighton
WOODHAM, HENRY, Twickenham, Licensed Victu'ler Oct 27 Adams, Victoria st
WOODLAND, JAMES, Leicester, Boot Factor Oct 30 Stevenson & Son, Leicester

Bankruptcy Notices.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Sept. 12.

ADJUDICATIONS.

ATKINS, HARRY SEWELL, Stoke Newington rd, Job-
master Edmonton Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8
BROWN, FLORENCE ELIZABETH, Southville, Bris-ol Bristol
Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8
CALEY, LOUIS, Kingston upon Hull, Publican Kingston
upon Hull Pet Aug 1 Ord Sept 9
DALTON, EDGAR, West Malling, Traveller Maidstone
Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7
DARBY, WILLIAM HENRY D ESTERRE, Clarges st, Piccadilly
High Court Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 6
EDWARDS, W. J., Ullowater rd, Palmers Green High
Court Pet July 14 Ord Sept 9
EMANUEL, MARK, Kennington Park rd, Jeweller High
Court Pet Aug 5 Ord Sept 7
GORTZ, ISIDORE, Regent st High Court Pet Aug 8 Ord
Sept 8
GORTZ, WILLIAM, Oxford st, High Court Pet Aug 8 Ord
Sept 8
HALL, ROBERT, Forncett St Peter, Norfolk, Farmer
Norwich Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8
HAMLEY, CECIL FRANCIS OSBERTUS, Hampstead Hill gdns,
Hampstead High Court Pet Jan 10 Ord Sept 8
HUGHES, HERBERT WILLIAMS, Handbridge, C-ester, Car
Proprietor Chester Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7
HUNTING, HAROLD EDWARD, Shirebrook, Derby, Hatter
Nottingham Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8
HYDE, WILLIAM HENRY HERBERT, Huggin In, Manu-
facturer's Agent High Court Pet July 25 Ord Sept 7
JACKSON, FREDERICK EVANS, Manchester, Publisher Man-
chester Pet Aug 23 Ord Sept 7
JENKS, G CLEMENT, Coventry High Court Pet June 29
Ord Sept 9
JONES, PETER HENRY, Rhyll, Flint, Restaurant Keeper
Bangor Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8
MOOLY, HERBERT BRYANT, and EDGAR MITCHELL, Fulham
rd, Stationers High Court Pet Aug 10 Ord Sept 8
PASHLEY, ALBERT, Nottingham, Wholesale Tobacconist
Nottingham Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7
PHIPPS, HERBERT, Shrivensham, Berks, Licensed Victu'lar
Swindon Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8
PLANT, EMILY, Manchester, Mantle Dealer Manchester
Pet July 10 Ord Sept 8
POTHECARY, HENRY HERBERT, Mansfield, Notts, Printer
Nottingham Pet Aug 15 Ord Sept 4
RICE, RAMAH FREDERICK Lowestoft, Smackowner Great
Yarmouth Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8
RICHMAN, WOLFE, Leeds, General Dealer Leeds Pet Sept
6 Ord Sept 6
VILLIS, EDWARD, Bridgwater, Timber Haulier Bridgwater
Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8
WILSON, JOHN EDWARD, Leeds, Perambulator Manufac-
turer Leeds Pet June 30 Ord Sept 7

Amended Notice substituted for that published in
the London Gazette of Aug 29:

ANTOINE, GUSTAVE GODCHAUD, Finsbury House, London
Wall High Court Pet June 10 Ord Aug 21

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Sept. 15.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

ABRENS, JULIUS HENRY, Leadenhall st High Court Pet
May 3 Ord Sept 11
BOXHALL, WILLIAM, Abercraive, Brecon, Decorator Neath
Pet Sept 11 Ord Sept 11
CHAPPELL, A S, Isledon rd, Finsbury Park, Builder High
Court Pet Aug 9 Ord Sept 11

CORIS, JOSE, Leadenhall st, Salt Merchant High Court
Pet Aug 9 Ord Sept 11
DODGO, CHARLES, Great Grimaby, Art Needlework Dealer
Great Grimaby Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 9
DURELL, Lieut R C V, Devonport High-Court Pet May 31
Pet Sept 11
GARDOTT, WILLIAM JOHN KAY, Manchester, Joiner Man-
chester Pet Sept 13 Ord Sept 13
HARMAN, EMANUEL, Great Yarmouth, Builder Great
Yarmouth Pet Sept 13 Ord Sept 13
HARFIS, WILLIAM, Maltby, Yorks, Journeyman Gas Fitter
Sheffield Pet Sept 12 Ord Sept 12
HILLA, FREDERICK JAMES, Westcliff on Sea, Professor of
Swimming Chelmsford Pet Sept 11 Ord Sept 11
HOUNSLOW, EDWARD, Vernham Dean, Hants, Coal Dealer
Salisbury Pet Sept 12 Ord Sept 12
JONES, WILLIAM, Upper Llandwrog Carnarvon, Labourer
Bangor Pet Sept 11 Ord Sept 11
MORTON, SARAH SUSAN, Oxford High Court Pet Aug 5
Ord Sept 13
MORSE, PHILIP, Whitechapel, Tailor High Court Pet Aug
23 Ord Sept 13
MULVANEY, THOMAS, Bolton, Master Carter Bolton Pet
Sept 12 Ord Sept 12
OVENS, ROBERT, Newcastle upon Tyne, Builder Newcastle
upon Tyne Pet Sept 12 Ord Sept 12
PAPE, CECIL DAVIS, Emsworth, Sussex Brighton Pet July
19 Ord Sept 13
PARKIN, BENJAMIN KING, Leadenhall st, Engineer High
Court Pet July 28 Ord Sept 13
PROUD, ALGERNON PERCY, Newcastle upon Tyne, Furni-
ture Dealer Newcastle upon Tyne Pet Sept 6 Ord
Sept 13
ROBERTS, FREDERICK JOSEPH, Jewin st, Children's
Millinery Manufacturer High Court Pet Sept 12
Ord Sept 12
SIMPSON, JOSEPH, Workop, Nottingham, Labourer
Sheffield Pet Sept 11 Ord Sept 11
SUDDEN, EDITH, MARY, Rotherham, Laundry Manageress
Sheffield Pet Sept 13 Ord Sept 13
TAYLOR, GEORGE GIBSON, Shaw Brewery, St Melkham,
Wilts, Brewer Bath Pet Sept 13 Ord Sept 13
THOMPSON, GEORGE, Hale, Chester, Advertising Contractor
Manchester Pet Aug 25 Ord Sept 13
THOMPSON, JOSEPH GARET, HENRY EDWARD THOMPSON, and
WILLIAM THOMPSON, Dudley, Worcester, Painters
Dudley Pet Sept 11 Ord Sept 11
WHEELER, RICHARD, Cardiff, Haulage Contractor Cardiff
Pet Aug 31 Ord Sept 12
WILSON, HENRY, Brighouse, York, Carpet Merchant
Halifax Pet Sept 11 Ord Sept 11
WILSON, MINNIE MAUD, Basington, Lodging House
Keeper Stockton on Tees Pet Sept 12 Ord Sept 12
WINTER, GEORGE YOUNG, Gatahead, Dairyman, Newcastle
upon Tyne Pet Sept 13 Ord Sept 13

Amended Notice substituted for that published in the
London Gazette of Aug 1:

WEBB, HENRY, Wolverhampton, Musical Instrument Dealer
Wolverhampton Pet July 25 Ord July 25

FIRST MEETINGS.

ABRENS, JULIUS HENRY, Leadenhall st Sept 26 at 11
Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
ATKINS, HARRY SEWELL, Stoke Newington rd, Jobmaster
Sept 26 at 3 Off Rec, 14, Bodford row
BAKERS, HENRY, Llanharan, Glam, Collier Sept 23 at 3 117,
St Mary st, Cardiff
CHAPPELL, A S, Isledon rd, Finsbury Park, Builder Sept
20 at 1 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
CORIS, JOSE, Leadenhall st, Salt Merchant Sept 26 at 12
Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
DAVIES, WILLIAM REES, Holyhead, Public Entertainment
Sept 25 at 12 Crypt chmbrs, Eastgate row, Chester

DODGO, CHARLES, Great Grimaby, Art Needlework Dealer
Sept 23 at 11 Off Rec, st Mary's chmbrs, Great
Grimaby
DURELL, Lieut, R C V, Devonport Sept 23 at 11 Bank-
ruptcy bldgs, Carey st
FOX, HENRY JOSEPH, Norwich, Tobacco Dealer Sept 23 at
13.30 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich
HALL, ROBERT, Forncett st Peter, Norfolk, Farmer Sept
23 at 4.30 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich
HARFIS, WILLIAM, Maltby, Yorks, Journeyman Gas Fitter
Oct 5 at 12 Off Rec, Figtree In, Sheffield
HOPEWELL, CYRIL MARSH, Nottingham, Teacher of Music
Sept 27 at 11 Off Rec, 4, Castle pl, Park st, Notting-
ham
HOUNSLOW, EDWARD, Vernham Dean, Hants, Coal Dealer
Sept 23 at 11.30 Off Rec, City Chambers, Catherine st,
Salisbury
HOVLARD, WILLIAM, Sheffield, Printer Sept 27 at 11.30
Off Rec, Figtree In, Sheffield
JACKSON, FREDERICK EVANS, Manchester, Publisher Sept
23 at 11 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester
KELLOCK, J B, Old Broad st Sept 25 at 12 Bankruptcy
bldgs, Carey st
MORTON, SARAH SUSAN, Oxford Sept 27 at 1 Bankruptcy
bldgs, Carey st
MORSE, PHILIP, High st, Whitechapel, Tailor Sept 27 at 11
Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
OVENS, ROBERT, Newcastle upon Tyne, Builder Sept 26
at 11 Off Rec, 3, Mosley st, Newcastle upon Tyne
PARKIN, BENJAMIN KING, Leadenhall st, Engineer Sept
27 at 1 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
PASHLEY, ALBERT, Nottingham, Wholesale Tobacconist
Sept 27 at 12 Off Rec, 4, Castle pl, Park st, Not-
tingham
PHIPPS, HERBERT, Shrivensham, Berks, Licensed Victu'lar
Sept 25 at 3 Off Rec, 35, Regent circus, Swindon
ROBERTS, FREDERICK JOSEPH, Jewin st, Children's Mil-
linery Manufacturer Sept 27 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs
Carey st
ROBINSON, SAMUEL, Stanion, Northampton, Butcher,
Sept 23 at 12 Off Rec, The Parade, Northampton
SIMPSON, JOSEPH, Maryport, Cumberland, Tobacconist,
Sept 25 at 2.45 Court House, Cockermouth
SIMPSON, JOSEPH, Workop, Labourer Sept 27 at 12 Off
Rec, Figtree In, Sheffield
SNOW, FRANCIS, Okehampton, Devon, Poultry Dealer Sept
26 at 3.30 7, Buckland ter, Plymouth
WILSON, HENRY, Brighouse, Carpet Merchant Sept 23
at 10.45 Off Rec, County Court, Prescott st, Halifax
WINTER, GEORGE YOUNG, Gatahead, Dairyman Sept 28 at
11 Off Rec, 30, Mosley st, Newcastle upon Tyne
WOOLLEN, HENRY K, Liscard, Chester Sept 25 at 3 Off
Rec, 25, Victoria st, Liverpool

ADJUDICATIONS.

BOXHALL, WILLIAM, Abercraive, Brecon, Decorator Neath
Pet Sept 11 Ord Sept 11
CUMES, HENRY ALEXANDER BARAZON, St Swithin's In,
Underwriter High Court Pet Aug 1 Ord Sept 14
DODGO, CHARLES, Great Grimaby, Art Needlework Dealer
Great Grimaby Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 9
FOX, HENRY JOSEPH, Norwich, Tobacco Dealer Norwich
Pet Aug 26 Ord Sept 13
GARDOTT, WILLIAM JOHN KAY, Manchester, Joiner Man-
chester Pet Sept 13 Ord Sept 13
HARMAN, EMANUEL, Great Yarmouth, Builder Great
Yarmouth Pet Sept 13 Ord Sept 13
HARFIS, WILLIAM, Maltby, Yorks, Journeyman Gas Fitter
Sheffield Pet Sept 12 Ord Sept 13
HARRIS, ISRAEL, Sutherland av, Maida Vale, Wholesale Rag
Merchant High Court Pet Aug 26 Ord Sept 14
HILLA, FREDERICK JAMES, Westcliff on Sea, Professor of
Swimming Chelmsford Pet Sept 11 Ord Sept 11

THE LICENSES INSURANCE CORPORATION AND GUARANTEE FUND, LIMITED,

24, MOORGATE STREET, LONDON, E.C.

ESTABLISHED IN 1890.

EXCLUSIVE BUSINESS—LICENSED PROPERTY.

X

SPECIALISTS IN ALL LICENSING MATTERS.

Upwards of 650 Appeals to Quarter Sessions have been conducted under the
direction and supervision of the Corporation.

X

Suitable Insurance Clauses for inserting in Leases or Mortgages of Licensed Property, Settled by Counsel, will be sent
on application.

LAW EXAMINATIONS

(London University),
AND
SOLICITORS' EXAMINATIONS
(The Law Society).

COURSES ARE PROVIDED BY

University Correspondence College

FOR THE ABOVE EXAMINATIONS.

COMPOSITION FEES FOR FULL PREPARATION.

London Intermediate Laws	£13 12s.
London Bachelor of Laws	£19 19s.
Intermediate Solicitors' Examination	£8 8s.
Final Solicitors' Examination	£9 19s. 6d.

Complete U.C.C. Prospectus, giving full particulars of Courses, post free on application to
THE SECRETARY, Burlington House, Cambridge.

HUNNELL, EDWARD, Varnham Dean, Hants, Coal Dealer Salisbury Pet Sept 12 Ord Sept 12
JONES, WILLIAM, Upper Llandwrog, Carnarvon, Labourer Bangor Pet Sept 11 Ord Sept 11
MONTAGU, ROBERT GEORGE, Maidenhead, Dealer in Antiques Windsor Pet June 20 Ord Sept 9
MULVANEY, THOMAS, Bolton, Master Carver Bolton Pet Sept 12 Ord Sept 12
OVERY, ROBERT, Newcastle upon Tyne, Builder Newcastle upon Tyne Pet Sept 12 Ord Sept 12
ROBERTS, FREDERICK JOSEPH, Jewin st, Children's Millinery Manufacturer High Court Pet Sept 12 Ord Sept 12
SIMPSON, JOSEPH, Workshop, Labourer Sheffield Pet Sept 11 Ord Sept 11
SUGGERS, EDITH MARY, Rotherham, Laundry Manageress Sheffield Pet Sept 12 Ord Sept 12
TAYLOR, GEORGE GRIBELL, Shaw Brewery, nr Molksham, Wills, Brewer Bath Pet Sept 13 Ord Sept 13
THOMPSON, JOSEPH GREEN, HENRY EDWARD THOMPSON, and WILLIAM THOMPSON, Dudley, Worcester, Painters Dudley Pet Sept 11 Ord Sept 11
TUCKER, GEORGE ALBERT THOMAS, Weston super Mare, Solicitor Bristol Pet Aug 29 Ord Sept 11
WILLIAMS, CHARLES EDWARD GABRIEL, Manchester, Company Director Manchester Pet July 19 Ord Sept 13
WILSON, HENRY, Brighouse, Carpet Merchant Halifax Pet Sept 11 Ord Sept 11
WILSON, MINNIE MAUD, Darlington Stockton on Tees Pet Sept 12 Ord Sept 12
WINTER, GEORGE YOUNG, Gateshead, Dairyman Newcastle upon Tyne Pet Sept 13 Ord Sept 13

Amended Notice substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Aug 1:

WERN, HENRY, Wolverhampton, Musical Instrument Dealer Wolverhampton Pet July 28 Ord July 28

Amended Notice substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Sept 12:

JENKS, GEORGE CLEMENT, Coventry High Court Pet June 20 Ord Sept 9

ADJUDICATION ANNULLED.

MALLET, JOHN, Regent rd, Lowestoft, Suffolk, Fish Merchant Great Yarmouth Adj'd Dec 10, 1910 Annul Sept 11, 1911

RECEIVING ORDERS.

London Gazette.—Tuesday, Sept 19.

ADAMS, JAMES JOSEPH, Nottingham, Builder Nottingham Pet Sept 1 Ord Sept 15
BRAUMONT, HENRY WALTER, Leiston, Suffolk, Wheelwright Ipswich Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 16
BECKWITH, WILLIAM PERCY CORNELIOUS, York, Tailor York Pet Sept 13 Ord Sept 13
BRADSHAW, GEORGE ROBERT, Leicester, Wood Last Manufacturer Leicester Pet Sept 2 Ord Sept 16
BRANCKE, FRANK JAMES, Coventry, Licensed Victualler Coventry Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 16
BRINDLEY, FREDERICK, Pendleton, Salford, Plumber Salford Pet June 17 Ord Sept 13
BROWNBRIDGE, CHARLES HENRY, St John's Chapel, Durham, Hotel Proprietor Durham Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14
DOVER, JOHN GEORGE, Darlington, Engine Fitter Stockton on Tees Pet Sept 15 Ord Sept 15

ENDACOTT, GEORGE, St Mary Church, Devon, Baker Exeter Pet Sept 13 Ord Sept 13
GOODALL, JOHN TRENFIELD, and JOHN PELHAM GOODALL, Reigate, Tailors Croydon Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14
GOUDGE and BRAZIER, Fleet st, Advertising Contractors High Court Pet Aug 5 Ord Sept 14
HIGGINS, CECIL, Bradford, Confectioner Bradford Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 16
HILL, GEORGE, Leadenhall st, Engineer's Stove Merchant High Court Pet July 23 Ord Sept 15
HOLMAN, THOMAS, Horwood, Devon, Farmer Barnstaple Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 16
HOWE, EMILY MARY, Guildford st, Russell sq High Court Pet July 29 Ord Sept 15
ISRAEL, JOSEPH, Bow rd, Fish Salesman High Court Pet Aug 24 Ord Sept 15
MOFFATT, JOHN GEORGE, Wantage, Berks, Farmer Oxford Pet Sept 15 Ord Sept 15
NOBLE, WILLIAM DESMOND, Wells st, Stepney, Chemist High Court Pet Aug 18 Ord Sept 13
NOWNE, WILLIAM ALBERT, CLIFFORD WONNACOTT and HERBERT HENRY LEWIS, Watford, Clothiers St Albans Pet Aug 8 Ord Sept 13
OSBORN, STUART, Datchet, Bucks Windsor Pet Aug 18 Ord Sept 16
PAGAN, JOHN BROWN, Woodbridge, Suffolk, Watchmaker Lincoln Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 16
PIDGEN, SIDNEY WALTER, Bangor, Music Dealer Bangor Ipswich Pet Sept 15 Ord Sept 15
PLATER, ELIJAH HOLLAND, Lincoln, Licensed Victualler Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14
SOMMERFELD, LEOPOLD BERNARD, High st, Borough, Granite Merchant High Court Pet Aug 18 Ord Sept 15
THOMPSON, LIEUT W H HALFORD, Bristol High Court Pet Aug 16 Ord Sept 14
TYLER, WALTER WILLIAM, Denmark hl High Court Pet July 1 Ord Sept 14
WARD, REGINALD, London Wall, Company Promoter High Court Pet Aug 1 Ord Sept 14
WESTHEAD, EDWARD ERNEST, Sutton St Helena, Lancs, Barman Liverpool Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14
WOOD, ROBERT, Great Grimsby, Auctioneer Great Grimsby Pet Aug 23 Ord Sept 11

Amended Notice substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Sept 15:

THOMPSON, GEORGE, Hale, Cheshire Manchester Pet Aug 25 Ord Sept 13

FIRST MEETINGS.

BRAUMONT, HENRY WALTER, Leiston, Suffolk, Wheelwright Sept 28 at 2.30 Off Rec, 36, Princes st, Ipswich
BECKWITH, WILLIAM PERCY CORNELIOUS, York, Tailor Sept 28 at 3 Off Rec, the Red House, Duncombe pl, York
BOXHALL, WILLIAM, Abercraze, Brecon, Decorator Sept 27 at 11 Off Rec, Government bldgs, St Mary's st, Swansea
BRADSHAW, GEORGE ROBERT, Leicester, Wood Last Manufacturer Sept 27 at 3 Off Rec, 1, Berridge st, Leicester

BROWN, FLORENCE ELIZABETH, Bristol Sept 27 at 11.30 Off Rec, 26, Baldwin st, Bristol
ENDACOTT, GEORGE, St Mary Church, Devon, Baker Sept 27 at 11.45 Off Rec, 9, Bedford circus, Exeter
GOUDGE and BRAZIER, Fleet street, Advertising Contractors Sept 28 at 1 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
HARDIE, MARY, Barton in Furness Sept 27 at 11.15 Off Rec, 16, Cornwallis st, Barrow in Furness
HARMAN, EMMAUEL, Great Yarmouth, Builder Sept 27 at 12.30 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich
HILL, GEORGE, Leadenhall st, Engineer's Stove Merchant Sept 29 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
HILLS, FREDERICK JAMES, Westcliff on Sea, Essex, Professor of Swimming Oct 4 at 2 Shire Hall, Chelmsford
HOWE, EMILY MARY, Guildford st, Russell sq Sept 28 at 11 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
ISRAEL, JOSEPH, Bow rd, Fish Salesman Sept 29 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
MOORE, DE LA HEY, Clifton, Dentist Pet Sept 27 at 12 Off Rec, 26, Baldwin st, Bristol
MULVANEY, THOMAS, Bolton, Lancs, Master Carver Sept 27 at 11 Off Rec, 19, Exchange st, Bolton
NEWTON, WILLIAM GRAHAM, Nottingham, Lace Manufacturer Sept 27 at 3.30 Off Rec, 4, Castle pl, Park st, Nottingham
NOBLE, WILLIAM DESMOND, Wells st, Stepney, Chemist Sept 28 at 13 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
PAGAN, JOHN BROWN, Woodbridge, Suffolk, Watchmaker Sept 28 at 2 Off Rec, 36, Princes st, Ipswich
PROUD, ALGERNON PERCY, Newcastle upon Tyne, Furniture Dealer Sept 27 at 11 Off Rec, 30, Mosley st, Newcastle upon Tyne
RICE, RAMAN FREDERICK, Lowestoft, Smack Owner Sept 28 at 2.30 Suffolk Hotel, Lowestoft
RICHARDS, WILLIAM LITSON, Braintree, Devon, Boarding-house Keeper Sept 27 at 3.30 94, High st, Barnstaple
SOMMERFELD, LEOPOLD BERNARD, High st, Borough, Granite Merchant Sept 28 at 13 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
THOMPSON, JOSEPH GREEN, HENRY EDWARD THOMPSON, and WILLIAM THOMPSON, Dudley, Worcester, Painters Sept 29 at 12 Off Rec, 1, Priory st, Dudley
THOMPSON, LIEUT W H HALFORD, Bristol Sept 29 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
TYLER, WALTER WILLIAM, Denmark hl Sept 29 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
VILLIS, EDWARD, Bridgewater, Somerset, Timber Haulier Sept 27 at 11.45 Off Rec, 26, Baldwin st, Bristol
WARD, REGINALD, London Wall, Company Promoter Sept 28 at 1 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
WILSON, MINNIE MAUD, Darlington Sept 28 at 11.30 Off Rec, Court chambers, Albert rd, Middlesbrough

ADJUDICATIONS.

BAKER, FRANCES FREDERICK, North Malvern, Worcester, Builder Worcester Pet Aug 18 Ord Sept 16
BRAUMONT, HENRY WALTER, Leiston, Suffolk Wheelwright Ipswich Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 16
BECKWITH, WILLIAM PERCY CORNELIOUS, York, Tailor York Pet Sept 13 Ord Sept 13
BRANSON, FRANK JAMES, Coventry, Licensed Victualler Coventry Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 16
BROWNBRIDGE, CHARLES HENRY, St John's Chapel, Durham, Hotel Proprietor Durham Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14
CARR, DAVID SHARP, Wembley, Middx, Horse Dealer St Albans Pet Aug 30 Ord Sept 14
CHAPPELL, ALBERT SMITH, Leiston rd, Finsbury Park, Builder High Court Pet Aug 9 Ord Sept 15
CLAMPITT, GEORGE, Kings rd, 86 Pancras, Coal Merchant High Court Pet Aug 1 Ord Sept 16
CORBETT, F, Dalebury rd, Upper Tooting Wandsworth Pet July 21 Ord Sept 14
COTTON, GERALD MCLYOD POWELL, Bitchington, Kent, Wine Merchant Canterbury Pet June 16 Ord Sept 15
DOVER, JOHN GEORGE, Darlington, Engine Fitter Stockton on Tees Pet Sept 15 Ord Sept 15
ENDACOTT, GEORGE, St Mary Church, Devon, Baker Exeter Pet Sept 12 Ord Sept 13
FLETCHER, REGINALD, Pinner, Middx St Albans Pet July 10 Ord Sept 14
GOODALL, JOHN TRENFIELD, and JOHN PELHAM GOODALL, Reigate, Tailors Croydon Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14
GRONQVIST, PERH JONSSON, Davies st, Berkeley sq, Tailor High Court Pet Aug 24 Ord Sept 16
HIGGINS, CECIL, Bradford, Confectioner Bradford Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 16
HOLMAN, THOMAS, Horwood, Devon, Farmer Barnstaple Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 16
MOFFATT, JOHN GEORGE, Wantage, Berks, Farmer Oxford Pet Sept 15 Ord Sept 15
PAGAN, JOHN BROWN, Woodbridge, Suffolk, Watchmaker Ipswich Pet Sept 15 Ord Sept 15
PIDGEN, SIDNEY WALTER, Bangor, Music Dealer Bangor Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14
PLATER, ELIJAH HOLLAND, Lincoln, Licensed Victualler Lincoln Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 16
THOMPSON, GEORGE, Hale, Cheshire Manchester Pet Aug 25 Ord Sept 13
WESTHEAD, EDWARD ERNEST, Sutton St Helena, Lancs, Barman Liverpool Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 14
WHEELER, RICHARD, Cardiff, Haulage Contractor Cardiff Pet Aug 31 Ord Sept 15

f.
11.30
Sept
Con-
at
11.15
Sept 27
Merchant
Pro-
helma-
25 at
at 12
Sept 27
Sept
ntufac-
rk at,
unist
maker
Furni-
ey at,
Sept
rding-
staple
rough,
bldg,
luters
at 11
at 12
aulier
moter
O Off
ester,
Wheel-
Tailor
ualler
Dur-
Ord
dealer
Park,
chant
worth
Kent,
Ord
stock-
Baker
Pet
DALL,
Sept 14
Tailor
Pet
staple
xford
maker
angor
ualler
st Aug
Lanca,
Cardiff